



LIBRARY
OF THE
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
AT
PRINCETON, N. J.

DONATION OF
SAMUEL AGNEW,

OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Letter
No.

March 25th 1858.

BT 111 .085 v.1
Oxlee, John, 1779-1854.
The Christian doctrines of
the Trinity and incarnation

THE
CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES
OF THE
TRINITY AND INCARNATION
Considered and Maintained
ON THE
PRINCIPLES OF JUDAISM.
—
BY THE
REV. JOHN OXLEE.
—
VOL. I.

Quemadmodum enim unus idemque homo, si Deo mane aliud offerat, aliud vespere, pro congruentia diurni temporis, non Deum mutat, non Religionem; sicut nec salutem, qui alio modo mane, alio vespere salutat. Ita in universo tractu seculorum, cum aliud oblatum est ab antiquis sanctis, aliud ab eis qui nunc sunt offertur, non humana presumptione, sed auctoritate divina temporibus congrua sacra mysteria celebrantur, non Deus aut Religio commutatur.

AUGUSTINUS AD DEOGRATIAS.

—
LONDON:
PRINTED AT THE LONDON SOCIETY'S OFFICE, SPITALFIELDS.
SOLD BY HATCHARD, PICCADILLY; AND RIVINGTONS,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD.

—
1815.

— 1 —

MINTOSH, Printer.

SYLLABUS OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	3
PROP. I.	
CHAP.	
I. <i>That God is an immaterial Being; proved from the Jewish Writers in general</i>	16
II. <i>The same further demonstrated from the Cabalists in particular</i>	20
III. <i>That God is a spiritual Being</i>	26
IV. <i>The same also the Doctrine of the Christian Church</i>	29
PROP. II.	
I. <i>The Doctrine of the Trinity unfolded, and proposed to be demonstrated</i>	32
II. <i>From Analogy; with a Refutation of certain Objections</i>	34. 39. 43. 50
III. <i>From the Consideration that every spiritual Subsistency is an Emanation from the Deity; with the Solution of a Difficulty</i>	57. 66
IV. <i>From the Names of the Supreme Being being common appellations; the plurality of Elohim, &c.</i>	68. 80
V. <i>From God speaking of himself in the first Person plural; with a Refutation of the Objections</i>	94. 96. 100
VI. <i>From the Trinity being a perfect and necessary Number</i>	104

SYLLABUS OF CONTENTS.

CHAP.	PAGE
VII. <i>From the many symbolical Actions and Expressions in sacred History</i>	113
VIII. <i>From the Mystery of the Metatron</i>	126
IX. <i>From the Numerations of the Cabalists; with the Solution of some Difficulties</i>	152. 181. 184
X. <i>From the Pre-existences of the Daruschists</i>	185
XI. <i>From the personal Designations of the Targumists and Talmudists; with Answers to certain Objections</i>	203. 212. 228. 248. 255. 271. 287
XII. <i>From the respective Distinctions of the Cabalists, Daruschists, and Targumists harmonizing with each other</i>	288
XIII. <i>The whole of the Arguments recapitulated</i>	304
XIV. <i>That the same is also the Doctrine of the Christian Church; with the solution of a Difficulty, &c.</i>	308. 312. 317
XV. <i>The general Grounds of Objection, on the Part of the Jew, considered and refuted</i>	325

THE

CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES,

&c. &c.

INTRODUCTION.

THAT with the benevolent design of persuading the sons of Jacob to accept salvation, many serious though futile attempts have been made by the philosophers and divines of the Christian church; and, that they have ever been ready and even anxious to promote their happiness and prosperity, are positions which I am not disposed to deny. But whilst those fruitless efforts may serve to exempt us from the charge of a total indifference to their eternal welfare, I can never be induced to confess, that in detecting their religious prejudices, or in recommending to their acceptance our own peculiar tenets; we have always displayed the highest degree of learning and acuteness; or, that the mediocrity of talent occasionally exerted in disputation with members of the Jewish community has been directed and employed always with judgment and decorum.

In the infancy of the Christian church, and immediately after the general dispersion, which necessarily followed the sacking of Jerusalem and Bither; the Greek and Latin Fathers had the fairest opportunity of disputing with the Jews, and of evincing the truth of the Gospel dispensation; but, unfortunately for the success of so noble a design, they were totally ignorant of the Hebrew Scriptures; and so wanted, in every argument, that stamp of authority, which was equally necessary to sanction the principles of Christianity, and to command the respect of their Jewish antagonists. For the confirmation of this remark, I may appeal to the Fathers themselves, but especially to *Barnabas, †Justin, and ‡Irenaeus; who in their several attempts at Hebrew learning betray such portentous signs of ignorance and stupidity, that we are covered with shame at the sight of their criticisms. Hieronymus, indeed, knew something of Hebrew; but it was only a smattering, not by any means of that extent which has been vulgarly credited. If Origen knew any thing of it at all, it must have been merely the alphabet; for higher than that he certainly did not ascend, as I have fully demonstrated, I believe,

* Ep. Voss. Ed. p. 229. † Dial. cum Tryph. Col. Ed. p. 354,
et passim. ‡ Con. Haer. Lib. 1. c. 18.

in another place.* The rest of the Fathers, without excepting even St. Austin† himself, discarded all pretensions to a knowledge of the sacred original; otherwise, perhaps, with Origen at this day, they would many of them have been lauded by an ignorant posterity, as having been perfect masters of the Hebrew tongue.

This defect in the qualifications of the Greek and Latin Fathers for proselytizing the Jewish nation, I deeply lament; as the times, in which they flourished, were highly favourable to the reception of Christianity: and besides the singular opportunity of instituting a disputation whenever they had a mind, they combined with their enthusiastic zeal and resolution an accurate knowledge of the Gospel covenant, together with a profound skill in almost every branch of Pagan philosophy; so that nothing was wanted to render them perfect advocates of the Christian religion, except an easy familiarity with the language of the Old Testament. Nor ought it to be opposed in reply, that the Septuagint version was universally received among the Hellenists; and, that in a disputation with such of the Jews as possessed that version, an appeal to the original was neither proper nor necessary;

* *Classic. Journal*, Vol. vii. p. 122. † *Epp. ad Hieron.*

it being evident, that the more enlightened of the Jews consulted the Scriptures in the original dialect: without which, indeed, the Christian Fathers could never have availed themselves of their learned conversations, nor have confirmed their verbal criticisms always by the common apology, that they had it from a Hebrew.

But if the first six centuries supplied no masters in Hebraic erudition; to expect to find such in the succeeding ages, when almost every species of learning was swept away by the frequent inundations of the Goths and the Vandals must be vain and absurd. That no effort to bring over the Jews to Christianity was used even in the darkest ages of our church, I by no means assert; for when the civil jurisdiction of the Romish Pontiff began to be generally acknowledged in the western parts of Christendom, the conversion of all the world to Christianity, either by persuasion, deception, or compulsion, was regarded by the advocates for catholicism as an object, which ought to be universally desired, and steadily prosecuted; but that any learned and well designed tract on the tenets of the Gospel, such as might fairly be deemed sufficient for the conviction of a Jew not altogether wedded to the prejudices of education, was ever composed during the tyranny and profligacy of the

Romish prelates, I strenuously deny ; and if no other argument could be adduced to confirm the position, it might be enough to observe, that even so latterly as at the council of Trent, when the important question respecting the necessity of a new version fell under discussion ; not a member of the synod pretended to know any thing of the Hebrew dialect, but reclined altogether on the learning and authority of Cardinal Cajetan.*

No sooner, however, had the dawn of reformation begun to glimmer on the horizon, and the mists of ignorance and superstition to disappear at the approach of light and reason ; than there arose a constellation of oriental and biblical scholars, as well of the Romish as of the Protestant church. These certainly, had their energies been conjointly directed to the same end, possessed the means, not only of demonstrating to the Jew, in his own idiom, the truths of the Gospel ; but of wholly revealing to the Christian world the dark recesses of that gigantic fabric of Jewish superstition, the Talmud ; which, for any thing that modern Hebraists can effect towards leveling it with our understandings, must henceforth be contemplated with as much admiration and

* Vid. Hist. of the Council of Trent by Father Paul, in loc.

stupor as a colossus or a pyramid. Nay, if they had been but disposed to publish their arguments in distinct treatises, and had not dispersed them about, as we now find, in their various editions of the Hebrew classics; the effects of their conduct would have been felt at this day. Far be it from me, however, to detract from their labours; which I hold in the very highest esteem. Indeed the means which we now possess of studying the Hebrew, and of arriving at any degree of competency in it; is to be charged wholly on their bounty and generosity. The only thing which I regret is, that the conversion of the Jews was not the principal object of their Rabbinical studies; and, that the attainment of that object was not sought after, by founding the tenets of the Gospel on the basis of Judaism.

In the present generation many impediments concur to obstruct the progress, and to prevent the completion of so glorious a design. Within the last hundred years, the study of the Hebrew, Chaldaic, Syriac, and Rabbinical tongues, has been rapidly declining; and, if something should not happily fall out to retard the spreading of so depascent an evil, Hebrew in general, and the Rabbinical dialect in particular, will soon be unknown both to the clergy and laity. This evident decay of which I complain, is to be

cribed partly to the indolent disposition of the student, who refuses to sustain that labour, which is absolutely necessary to render him a sound linguist; and partly to the pernicious custom of learning without points.

It is a vulgar but erroneous opinion, that the Hebrew dialect is of most easy attainment; that the devoting of a few weeks, or at most of a few months, to the consideration of its grammatical properties, is all that is necessary to render us perfect masters of the beauty, genius, idiom, and import of this most ancient of tongues. But, if with the sacred volumes we may be permitted to class the various productions of the Talmudic, Cabballistic, and Rabbinical schools; the Hebrew of which scarcely differs so much from that of Moses and the prophets, as the Greek of the New Testament differs from that of Hesiod or Homer; so far from being of the most easy attainment, it will be found to be the most difficult of all the languages in the world; consisting of a copious stock of words and phrases, as well vernacular, as of Chaldaic, Syriac, Greek, and even Latin original; abounding with parabolical images and locutions; and adapted to convey the sentiments of the mind on any subject whatever, whether physical or moral. Conceding, however, what is by no means the fact, that the

Old Testament is the only book extant, in which pure Hebrew may be found; then it ought, on that very account, to be read the oftener over; in order that its genius and idiom may be the better ascertained. How should we regard the conduct of a critic on the New Testament, who taking for granted, that no other book except itself contained Greek in its purity, should, after having read a few verses in St. John, instantly proceed to pass judgment on the sacred original of the evangelists and apostles? Such, however, is the actual conduct of our biblical critics; who having with the aid of translations, and especially of the interlineary version of Pagninus, construed a solitary chapter or psalm, immediately sit down to comment on the scriptures; find fault with the received translations; and not unfrequently carry their presumption so far even as to correct the original.

But that which has chiefly led to the present decay of sacred learning is, as I have already observed, the rejection of the points. Perhaps it would be no hard matter to discover the true reason, why this new method of teaching and learning the Hebrew should find so many patrons. Does it not multiply the modes of verbal criticism, and conceal the defects of sound erudition? There is no possibility of investigating whether a

critic of this complexion, who to the honour of the critical profession unites the awful responsibility of expounding the oracles of God, really knows any thing of the language or not; unless his positions may be subjected to the rules of art, and examined on the principles of the Jewish Grammarians. It must be vain to contend with him, that such an assertion is repugnant to the laws of etymology or syntax; if no etymology or syntax be acknowledged, except that which arises in his own mind, from a ready comparison of the lexicons and concordances: for these, I lament to say, are made to supply the place of a regular course of reading, the indolence of the sacred critic being now such, that he prefers having his Hebrew on the library shelf, or in his pocket, to the less pleasing way of storing it in his head. But surely no man, possessed of a sound understanding, would discard the doctrines of punctuation merely on the ground, that the points have never been set to the copies of the synagogues; or, that no mention is made of them in the books of the Talmud; as these are the only plausible arguments, that have ever been advanced for discrediting their authority, and for banishing them from our schools as a modern invention. The pronunciation, to which they lead, is evidently that which obtained

among the Jews before the compilation of the Talmud; as will appear manifest to the least discerning, on comparing the proper names and other Hebrew terms to be found in the Greek versions of the Old Testament, and in the works of the Christian Fathers, with the given punctuation of them in the text of the Masoretes. If then it should even be admitted, that the characters were not invented till after the publication of the Talmuds; the argument can amount only to this; that, in the first ages of the Jewish church, the right pronunciation was delivered orally from master to scholar; but that afterwards they availed themselves of the vowel marks, as practised in other languages, and so committed it to the less arbitrary and uncertain rules of written tradition. It certainly carries with it, as it now stands, all the signs of having been formerly the popular pronunciation. The various anomalies with which it abounds may, on the supposition that it was once vulgarly spoken, and fluctuated as other living languages do from the caprice of custom; be easily accounted for; but on the ground, that it is altogether the child of art, will find no solution. The number of the vowels, in the mouth of a well exercised scholar, affords at least a pleasing variety of sound;

very different from that which arises from the jumbling together of the consonants in any fashion, as is the practice of our modern Hebraists. It is, besides, wholly undesigned; as many of the readings, which so strongly tend to confirm our tenets, might, by being differently pointed, be turned against us. In a word, I can find no sober nor ingenuous reason for the rejection of the points; which has had the two-fold pernicious effect, of increasing the indolence of the sacred student, and of widening the breach between the Christian and the Jew.

Thus having in my preliminary matter slightly touched on the inefficiency of our past endeavours towards reconciling the sons of Jacob to the worship of Christ, on the present decay of Jewish literature amongst us, and on the causes of that decay; I shall now detail my design, together with the method observed in this work; which is composed, not with the vain expectation of converting the Jews, but with the immediate view of diminishing their religious prejudices, and of exciting an inquiry amongst them into the merits of the question. It will contain, also, of itself, a distinct confirmation of the truth of our faith; in that Christianity, by being thus founded on Judaism, will derive additional support from the various extrinsic evidences of the

Jewish Church. That something ought to be attempted with the view of reconciling the differences betwixt us, is a reflection, in which my mind has long been occupied ; for it seems to me to be matter of astonishment, that a religion, which in its infancy could attract such numbers of the Jews in its favour, and induce many of them even to suffer death for the support of it, cannot at this day be so far recommended to persons of that persuasion, as to arrest their attention for a few moments, whilst we briefly unfold to them the grounds of our faith. Now the distinguishing tenets of the Christian Church are the Trinity of the Godhead, and the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ; all other differences bewixt the Jew and the Christian being either political or of inferior moment. For in maintaining the belief of the incorporeity of the Godhead, of the creation of the world out of nothing, of good and bad angels, of the inspiration of the prophets, of the free will of man, of the interposition of the Deity in sublunary concerns, of the efficacy of prayer, of the resurrection of the dead, and of a future state of rewards and punishments, they evidently concur with us, not differing from us to a greater extent, than we do from one another in discussing such doctrines. Maimonides, indeed,

has very frankly confessed, that the Trinity, which is so intimately connected with the Incarnation, that they cannot be separated, is the main distinction between Judaism and Christianity;* most other doctrinal points being common to both. The doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, then, I shall endeavour to erect, not indeed with that extent of erudition which the subject demands, but according to the materials with which I am furnished, on the certain and undisputed authorities of the inspired Penmen; of the Targumists, Talmudists, Cabballists, Darushists, and Commentators; so that, whatever may be thought of the edifice itself, the Jew shall be compelled to own, that the foundation on which it is required to stand, is the rock of truth, and the strength of adamant. Let the sum of the two doctrines be resolved into the three following *general* propositions.

1st. THAT GOD IS AN IMMATERIAL AND SPIRITUAL BEING.

2nd. THAT IN THE SAMENESS OF THE GODHEAD SUBSISTS A TRINITY OF PERSONS.

3rd. THAT THE SECOND PERSON OF THE TRINITY WAS INCARNATED OF THE VIRGIN MARY.

* More Nevochim, Part I. c. 71.

PROPOSITION I.

THAT GOD IS AN IMMATERIAL AND SPIRITUAL BEING.

CHAPTER I.

THE immateriality or spirituality of the God-head being the basis of all religion, whether natural or revealed ; it might seem almost needless, on the present occasion, to offer to establish on the authorities of the Jewish Church the truth of a proposition, which the Jews are equally obliged, if not equally prepared, with the Christians, to maintain and defend. For however they may differ in other respects, they do certainly agree in the belief of an immaterial and spiritual Being, who created and formed not only the worlds, as they now subsist ; but the very elements of which they are composed ; whilst they equally expel from their sacred communion those philosophers and divines, who either inculcate or insinuate the eternity of matter. That nothing essential, however, to the design of the present work may seem to be omitted, I shall proceed in a regular manner to confirm the first proposition on the authorities of the Jewish Church ; and particularly of their real metaphysicians, the Cabbalists.

The truth of the doctrine is vehemently insisted on, in a variety of places, by the great R. Moses ben Maimon; who founds upon it the unity of the Godhead, and ranks it among the fundamental articles of the Jewish religion. Thus in his celebrated letter* to the Jews of Marseilles, he observes : *וכבר חברתי אני הבוד נдол בלשון ערבי בעניינים אלה ושם ביארתי הראיות הברורות והמופתים החוקים על מציאות הבודה ית' ושהוא אחד אמיתי ושאינו גוף ונוריה ולא כה: בנווף:* “I have already composed on these questions “a work of considerable magnitude, in the “Arabic language; where I have adduced the “clearest demonstrations and the most power- “ful arguments respecting the essence of the “blessed Creator; both that he is truly one; “and that he is neither a body, nor a bodily “substance, nor yet any active principle resid- “ing in a body.” The singular manner too, in which Onkelos, in his Targum of the Law, has endeavoured to prevent the reader from viewing the Deity as a corporeal Being, is incessantly applauded by him, nor has he manifested less anxiety himself to guard against that error by making all the terms, which are applied to God in common with his creatures, equivocal in their

* Vid. Buxtorfii Inst. Epist. Hebraic. p. 444.

import and signification.* Thus in the great work, to which he alludes above, we find him expressing himself to the following effect: †
 והכוונה כולה מכל משכיל הרחיקת ההגשמה מהבורא יתعلا והשים ההשנות דהם כולם שכליו
 “The general design of us all :
 “is to remove corporeity from the Godhead ;
 “and to regard all those apprehensions, which
 “we have of the divine nature, as appertaining
 “to the understanding, and not to the senses.”
 אבל כמו שצרכן שיתופש‡ :
 בהמון ויהנכו הנערם על שם יתע אחר ואין
 צרכן שיעבד זולתו.cn צרכן שימסר להם על דרך
 קבלה שהשם אינו נופ ואין דמיון בין ובין
 “But as it is highly :
 “necessary, that this doctrine should be disse-
 “minated among the common people, and that
 “children should be initiated in it from early
 “youth; namely, That God is one, and that
 “there is no other to be worshiped besides
 “himself; so is it equally necessary to inculcate
 “into them by tradition; That God is incor-
 “poreal, and that there is no similitude, not
 “even in the least respect, between him and
 “his creatures.” Thus far Maimonides. The
 eloquent R. Jedaiah ben Bedraschi § furnishes a

* Vid. More Nevoch. Part I.

† More Nevoch. Part I. c. 28.

‡ More Nevoch. Part I. c. 35.

§ Bechinath Olam, c. 41.

similar testimony of the incorporeity of the Godhead : *לבי ראשית כל דרכיך תאמין שיש על כל יש מי שהוא סבתו וסוף כל הסבות אחת אשר לא תשנה : הוא הנמצא שאין גבול לשлемותו : ולא תקיף על חלק מצער ממנו ידיעת כל בעלי שכל : ותאמין שאינו נוף ולא כח מכהותינו מתשבב או בלתי מתערב :* "Thou shalt believe, O my heart, as the principle of all thy actions, that every thing which exists, how small soever it may be, has its efficient cause; and that at the extremity of all causes there is one, which is immutable. "He is self-existent; and of unlimited perfection. Neither can the knowledge of all the intelligent beings put together comprehend the least part of him. Thou shalt believe also, that he is not a body, nor any of our active principles, whether compounded of matter or uncompounded."

R. Lipman* denies that either corporeity, or limitation or division can belong to the divine nature : *וכשם שאין שיר על הישינוּפַגְנָשָׁמוֹת כְּדַי :* "But as neither body nor bodily substance can be predicated, according to what I have before asserted, of the Divinity; so neither does limitation or division in any degree appertain to it."

* Nitsachon, Par. Vaethchanan.

Indeed of such importance is the doctrine esteemed by the Jews of the present age, that it is made to form a distinguished and prominent part of their public creeds; and appears in their Prayer Books :*

אני מאמין באמונה שלמה
 שהBORא יתברך שמו אינו גוף כלל ישנווHO משני
 הנוף ואין לו שום דמיון כלל :
 "I believe with a perfect faith, that the Creator, blessed be his name, is not a bodily substance, nor to be apprehended by those, who can apprehend what is corporeal: neither do I believe, that there is any thing like him in the universe."

CHAPTER II.

BUT with respect to the Cabbalists, the immateriality of the Godhead is fully acknowledged in their frequent designation of it by the term, אין, *Nothing*; as well as by the term, בלימה, which also signifies Nothing, or that which can neither be conceived nor expressed. Thus R. Abraham ben David† :
 אבל בע"ה נקרא אין נקרא בלימה :
 "But the Supreme Crown, denominated Nothing, is also called the ineffable Being." Not that the Deity is absolutely nothing, or a total pri-

* Printed by Baruch of Amsterdam, in the year 1786.

† Com. on Sepher Jetsira, c. i. sect. 2. as cited by Rittangel.

vation of being; but, because it is nothing, that we can comprehend with the mind; being wholly incorporeal, and infinitely surpassing the faculties of conception. This the said R. Abraham ben David* has very clearly unfolded : וְהַחֲכָמָה אָמַר מְאֵין תָּמֵצָא פִּי מִכְּעָד שָׁאַנְנוּ מוֹשֵׁג מְהוֹתוֹ מִשְׁם
 הָא נִמְצָאת וְהִיא מִצְיאוֹת יְשִׁי מְאֵין אָמַן אֵין וְה
 הָעֵדָר נִמְוֹר כִּילָא וְתָהָוָה אַיִזָּה דָּבָר שִׁזְׁדָּמָן מַאֲיָזָה
 דָּבָר שִׁזְׁדָּמָן כָּל שְׁכַנְן שְׁלָא וְתָהָוָה יְשִׁ מְאֵין אָבָל
 נִקְרָא אֵין לְפִי שָׁאַנְנוּ מוֹשֵׁג לֹא מִצְדָּעַלְתָו וְלֹא מִצְדָּעַל
 עַצְמוֹ שְׁעַלְתָו הָוָא עַלְתַ הָעֲלוֹת וּנִקְרָא הָאֵין קְדָמוֹן
 לְפִי שָׁקְדָם לְעוֹלָם וְאֵין זֶה דָבָר נְשָׁמִי : But Wis-
 " dom, says the inspired penman, is found of
 " nothing; that is, derives its existence from
 " the Supreme Crown, the quiddity of which
 " cannot be apprehended. Thence it exists, and
 " this is the existence of something out of no-
 " thing. The Nothing, however, of which we
 " here speak, is not a total privation of being;
 " for even the accident of any thing is not form-
 " ed from that, which is itself an accident;
 " much less is that, which exists of itself, formed
 " from that, which is not; but he is called
 " Nothing, because he cannot be apprehended
 " either in respect of his cause, or in respect
 " of his substance; as his cause is the primary

* Ibid, sect. 1. as cited by Rittangel.

“cause; and he is called the primordial No-
 “thing, because he subsisted anterior to the uni-
 “verse, and is nothing corporeal.” Though the
 manner, in which this learned Cabbalist has elu-
 cidated the text of Job, may to many, who are
 accustomed only to the literal sense of Scripture,
 seem somewhat extraordinary; yet, that God is
 an immaterial Being, the patriarch* himself has
 very fully attested in affirming of him :
 הַנִּיעַבֵּר
 “Behold he :
 עַלְיָ וְלֹא אָרָא וַיַּחַלֵּף וְלֹא אָבִין לוֹ
 “passes by me, and I see him not; he shifts
 “from place to place, and I perceive him not.”
 Nor can the prophet Isaiah† be supposed to
 mean less, in that marked interrogation,
 וְאֵל מַי
 “To whom will ye :
 תַּדְמִינוּנִי וְאִשּׁוֹה יִאמֶר קָדוֹשׁ
 “assimilate me, that I should have my likeness,
 “saith the Holy Being?” Indeed the many splen-
 did representations of the Divinity to be found
 in the pious compositions, of the patriarchs and
 the prophets, who never fail to speak of him as
 an eternal, omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent,
 and beneficent Being; as superior and anterior
 to the worlds; bear evident testimony, that, in
 their notions of the Godhead, the ancients coin-
 cided with the modern Cabbalists; regarding
 it, indeed, as spiritual and immaterial, but never

* C. ix. v. 11.

† C. xl. v. 25.

asserting so much in the form of a proposition; that being foreign to the subject, and design of their writings.

But a further confirmation of the doctrine is deducible from the use of the compound term, אין סוף *Infinity*; which, being often employed by modern Cabballists to signify the Deity, excludes all idea of bodily substance; as nothing corporeal can exist without limits, not even in the imagination. Thus testifies a learned but anonymous commentator, on R. Simeon ben Jochai* :

אשר מטעם זה א"ס ב"ה שהוא עילת כל העילות וסבת כל הסבות הוא השר והאדון והרבון של כל השולמות באשר כלם ממן נאצלו ונבראו ונוצרו ונעשן : For this reason the blessed Infinity, who is the cause of all causes, and the principle of all principles, is the Prince, the Lord, and the Governor of all the worlds; as they are all derived, created, formed and made from him."

To this he soon after subjoins : הוא בין לפידעת הפילוסופים בין לפידעת המקובלים אין בו שום ידיעה והשנ' ולא ציור ולא דמיון אפילו אותן או נקוד לנודל העلمת אדרו ברוך הוא שאין לו סוף ותכל"י עד שבverb והקראהו המקובל' אין סוף רוצח לומר שאין סוף ותכל'י להשינו כי יוחשך يولאה השכל להשכיל ולהשיג בו שום ידיע' והשנה

* Com. on *Tikune Zohar*, as cited by *Rit.* but without further references.

כמו שאמר הנביא אל מי תדמיוני :
 " But of the Infinity, blessed be he, whether we regard
 " the opinion of philosophers, or the opinion of
 " divines ; there is neither knowledge, nor ap-
 " prehension, nor form, nor likeness, no not even
 " so much as a mark or a point, by reason of
 " the great absconson of his light, blessed be he,
 " who has neither end nor limit. Hence it is,
 " that divines call him, the infinite Being; mean-
 " ing that there is neither end nor boundary,
 " whereby to apprehend him ; as the human in-
 " tellect is dazzled and disabled from conceiving
 " any notion, or obtaining any apprehension of
 " him ; according to the prophet, when he makes
 " him say, To whom will ye liken me ?"

From a due consideration, then, of the fore-going evidences, no doubt can remain of the general assent of the Jewish church to the truth of the doctrine, That God is an immaterial Being ; which, indeed, has been as much insisted on, and as ably maintained by their divines as by ours, as well with respect to what we may know, as to what we may not know ; of so lofty a subject. They do not, as we have already seen, in denying the Godhead to be corporeal or material, regard it as a perfect non-entity, corresponding to the vacuum of modern philosophers ; but as a Being totally

abhorrent from any thing that we can find in the material world; and as nothing rather than something, of which we can form or retain any notion. On this head, the same commentator on R. Simeon ben Jochai,* has expressed himself so admirably on another occasion, that I cannot forbear citing him : אפי' אתה רוצח להפשיט מהשנת שכלה מכל מהשב' גשמיות ולצער במחשבת שכלה איזה צייר רוחני וلتפום במחשבתך שהוא רומה לאויה צייר שציירת במחשבתך עכ"ז אין שום מחשבה וכיור תופס בו כלל וכלל : Should you even be ready to divest : " your mind of every corporeal idea, and to " conceive in your imagination, any spiritual " form ; and to fancy in your mind, that he " is like the form which you have thus conceived " in your imagination ; notwithstanding this, " you will have no conception nor idea of " him at all." Indeed the deepest and most approved metaphysicians, as well of the Jewish as of the Christian persuasion, though they may sometimes appear to talk differently, always affirm negatively, whenever they speak of the divine nature ; telling us, for the most part, that it is an existence without origin, and without end, without body, parts, or passions.

* Ibidem.

CHAPTER III.

SEEING, however, that we assert the Godhead to be not only immaterial, but spiritual; whereby is meant, that it has the property of putting matter in motion; it may not be amiss to annex a few testimonies to shew, that this also is the opinion of the Jewish church. Thus the Psalmist :* *אנה אלך מרוחך ואני מפניך אברך : אם אסק שמיים שם אתה ואציעה שאול הנך :* “Whither shall I go from thy Spirit; “and whither shall I flee from thy presence? “If I ascend up to heaven, thou art there; “and if I go down to hell, thou art there.” That the term, *spirit*, is in this text put simply for, *self*, is evident from the personal pronoun being used instead of, *thy spirit*, in the subsequent pasuk; for doubtless Grammar requires that it should be, *thy spirit*, which is introduced in the beginning of the speech, as the principal subject, in all the places in which the pronoun is substituted; only they being on the present occasion synonymous, may be commuted for each other without altering the signification.

The prophet Isaiah,† too, clearly inculcates the spirituality of the Godhead in the follow-

* Ps. cxxxix. v. 7.

† c. xxxi. v. 3.

ומצרים אדם ולא אל וסוסיהם בשר ולא רוח : “ But Egypt is man, and not : God ; and their horses flesh, and not spirit.” In rightly estimating the validity of this testimony, we must keep in mind the genius of the Hebrew language ; which, to render a sentence energetic and emphatic, chuses to repeat, in somewhat different terms, the constituent parts of which it consists ; and that as well with the design of enforcing the sentiment, as of swelling the period. In the former member ; the prophet declares, that Egypt was man, and not God ; and then in terms of strict apposition enforces the sentiment by adding, that their cavalry was flesh, and not spirit ; which is just as if he had said : **ומצרים אשר להם סוסים במלחמה רק אדם והוא בשר ולא אל אשר רוח הוא :** “ But Egypt, which has horses : in war, is only man, that is, flesh, and not God, who is spirit.”

Indeed the truth of the argument is so generally admitted by the professors of Judaism, that their commentators in particular seem to regard it as an assumption, which is in need of no proof. Thus R. Isaac Abarbanel,* in his commentary on the Pentateuch, has very justly observed that **רוח**, *spirit*, is used as a common term for all

* Com. on 1 Kings, c. iii. v. 12.

abstract intelligences; and, in elucidating a certain text of the prophet Habakkuk, has not hesitated to class the Deity along with other spiritual substances: רְלֵשְׁזָהָר וְהַבְּהִירָה הוּא לוּ יְתָ “The meaning is, that God has his splendour and effulgency from himself, and not from any other cause; like the rest of spiritual beings.” So R. Moses Alshech: * כי הוּא רָוחָנִי וְאַנְחָנוּ “For He is spiritual; whereas we are: נְשָׁמִי:” “corporeal.”

R. Moses Ilpeles, † with equal beauty of sentiment and expression, represents the Deity, as the spiritual father of all Israelitish orphans: אם אָבֹדוּ אֲבִיהם שֶׁל בָּשָׂר וְדָם פָּנָשׁ עִם אֲבִיהם הרוחני שהוּא הַקְּבָח: “If they should lose: their natural father, they find in his stead their spiritual father, who is God.”

R. Menasseh ben Israel, † drawing a comparison between the soul of man and the divinity, regards spirituality as common to both: Atqui homo Deo non est similis ratione corporis, quia Deus caret corpore; sed respectu animæ. Nam illa spiritus est: Deus spiritus est. “But man does not resemble God in respect of his body, because God has no body; but in res-

* Hoil Mosche, ch. xii. † De Res. Mort. c. x.

“pect of his soul. For this is spirit; and so is
“God spirit.”

To adduce, however, all the testimonies to be found in aid of the first proposition, would be equally tedious and unnecessary. Indeed, if I had not considered it as the foundation of both the other propositions, which are to follow next in order; the patience of the reader, perhaps, would not have been exhausted with such an accumulation of evidences, as are here actually furnished. But the foregoing, whilst they seem sufficiently numerous, are in some measure necessary to the design of the work; which admits of no premises being laid down, that are not at the same time most amply and satisfactorily demonstrated.

CHAPTER IV.

THAT the Christian divines entertain similar conceptions of the Deity, will readily obtain credence, even from their bitterest opponents.

“So far are we, (said the eloquent Arnobius,*) from attributing to God corporeal affections and properties, that we even hesitate to ascribe to so august a Being, those mental ornaments

* *Adver. Gentes, Lib. iii. p. 140.*

“and virtues, to be pre-eminent in which is
“scarcely conceded to a few.”

“God is spirit, (says our Lord;*) and he, who
“worships him, must worship in spirit and in
“truth.” “For spirit, (says Origen,†) according
“to our definition of it, is not corporeal; neither
“is that fire, which is declared to be God by the
“inspired penman, when he says, Our God is
“a consuming fire; a bodily substance: as all
“these expressions are used figuratively, so as
“to denote that intellectual nature by terms,
“which have been already appropriated to bodily
“substances, and are familiar to the senses. As
“when sins are said to be wood, hay, and stub-
“ble; we do not mean, that sins are bodily
“essences; nor when good works are affirmed to
“be gold, silver, and gems; do we thereby intend
“that good works are corporeal: so neither
“when God is asserted to be fire, which con-
“sumes wood, hay, and stubble, and every es-
“sence of sin; do we thereby suppose him to
“be a bodily substance. And, as we do not con-
“ceive him to be corporeal, when he is asserted
“to be fire; so neither do we intend to say, that
“he is corporeal, when we affirm him to be
“spirit. For to distinguish intellectual from

* St. John, c. iv. v. 24. † Con. Celsum, Lib. vi. p. 324; Camb. ed.

“sensible objects, the scriptures are wont to de-
“nominate them spirits, and spiritual essences.”

From these few testimonies, which it were easy to augment in number, the reader may perceive with what hesitation the luminaries of our church proceed to affirm any thing positively of the Godhead; and how anxious they seem to abstract from it every accident and circumstance which might imply corporeity. In the defence of this doctrine, indeed, the Jew and the Christian are equally interested; and, had it been in the least degree necessary, it would certainly have afforded me the highest gratification to have collected into one view the united eloquence of both churches, on so truly divine and dignified a subject. The first proposition being thus concluded, I hasten to establish the second.

PROPOSITION II.

THAT IN THE SAMENESS OF THE GODHEAD SUBSISTS
A TRINITY OF PERSONS.

CHAPTER V.

THE second proposition being evidently complex, and asserting as well, that the Deity exists in a plurality of persons, as, that this plurality is a Trinity; will be best consulted by the component parts of it being kept distinct, and demonstrated singly, according to the order and manner in which they present themselves to the consideration of the mind. The truth of the leading position, that the Deity exists in a plurality of persons, may be evinced from its analogy with what we know of the manner, in which other incorporeal substances exist; from the consideration, that every spirituality is but emanation from the Godhead; from the various appellations of the Deity, even the most sacred and proper, being common to many individuals, as well as associated with verbs and other adjuncts of the plural number; and, finally, from the Divinity being observed to speak of itself not unfrequently

in the first person plural. The confirmation of the subsequent position, That the plurality is a trinity, may be drawn—from the trinity being a perfect and necessary number;—from certain symbolical or mystical expressions and actions of the inspired penmen, in which no other thing can be meant or insinuated;—from the mystery of the Metatron;—from the metaphysical distinctions of the Cabballists;—from the pre-existences of the Daruschists;—from the express denominations of the persons themselves by the Targumists and Talmudists;—and, lastly, from the mutual correspondence and perfect agreement of those personal designations of the Cabballists, Daruschists, Targumists, and Talmudists, on being compared with each other.

That the triunity of the godhead should thus need to be demonstrated in an indirect and circuitous manner, may, perhaps, in the mind of the reader, beget a suspicion of its truth; but to object to the tenet, merely on the ground, that we do not find it directly and positively declared in the scriptures, or in other ancient authorities, would be to object to the most important and fundamental articles of the Jewish religion; such as the being of God, the existence of angels, the resurrection of the dead, and a future retribution; which,

though evidently derived from the inspired penmen, and now invariably received among the professors of Judaism, do not, in the volumes of holy writ, appear in the form of plain propositions ; as, That God is, That angels exist, That the dead shall be raised again, and, That men shall be rewarded according to their actions ; but being frequently intimated and assumed, posterity is satisfied, that, with the ancient Hebrews, they formed a very essential and prominent part of their theological system.



CHAPTER II.

But not to digress too far from the train of argumentation laid down and agreed upon, I shall begin with establishing that proof of the leading position, which is drawn from its analogy with what we really know of the manner in which other incorporeal or spiritual substances exist ; and this I shall do with much greater particularity and caution, than may to many seem necessary, in order that the special objections of R. Moses and others to the truth of this argument may be the better obviated and confuted. I shall not enter, however, into the discussion of the question ; whether the souls

of brutes be real subsistences or merely accidents ; nor yet, whether angels differ from archangels in gradation of being ; as that is not needful to the support of my argument : but contenting myself with the commonly received notions, that angels are intelligences of a superior order, and that in dignity and excellency men rank next to angels, I shall bring such testimonies of the natures of both being perfectly immaterial, as well as severally existing in a diversity of persons, as will be competent to develop the grounds, on which the analogy is founded.

Now the vision of Micaiah* is a manifest proof, that angels are spirits, and, that they subsist many in number : רָאָיתִי אֶת יְהוָה יֹשֵׁב
 עַל כָּסָאוֹ וְכָל צְבָא הַשְׁמִים עַמְּדִים עַל וְמַנּוּ
 וְשָׁמְאָלוֹ : וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה מַיִּתְחַא אֶת אֲחָב בֶּן
 יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיַּעַל וַיַּפְלֵל בְּרִמְתָּן גָּלְעָד וַיֹּאמֶר זֶה אָמַר בְּכָה
 זֶה אָמַר בְּכָה : וַיֵּצֵא הָרוֹح וַיַּעֲמֹד לִפְנֵי יְהוָה וַיֹּאמֶר
 אָנָּי אָפָּהָנוּ וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶלְיוֹ בְּמַה : וַיֹּאמֶר אֶצְאָ
 וְהִיּוּתִי לְרוֹחַ שְׁקָר בְּפִי כָּל נְבִיאָיו וַיֹּאמֶר תְּפַתַּח
 וּנְסַבֵּב תְּכַל צָא וְעָשֵׂה בֶּן : “ I saw Jehovah sitting
 “ on his throne ; and all the host of heaven,
 “ attending on his right and on his left. And
 “ Jehovah said : Who will persuade Ahab, king
 “ of Israel, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth
 “ Gilead ? And one spake and said thus, and

* 2 Chron. c. xviii. v. 18.

“ another thus. But the spirit came forth, and
“ stood before the Lord, and said: I will per-
“ suade him. And Jehovah said to him: By
“ what means? And he said; I will go forth,
“ and become a lying spirit in the mouth of all
“ his prophets. And he said; Thou shalt per-
“ suade, and shalt prevail too: go forth, and do
“ so.” In this extraordinary vision, the prophet
represents the divinity as attended on both sides
with a numerous train of angels; and, that the
reader may not doubt of their being all individual
spirits, the subsisting spirit of pseudo-prophecy,
it is declared, stood forth in the council, and
devised the means of decoying the king of Israel.
For, though the transaction be related in the
form of a prophetic vision, and the deliberations
of the divine assembly declared in terms wholly
transferred from the speech of men; yet, as
the spirits, constituting the council, no matter
whether they be called the host of heaven, or the
angels of God, must needs be real subsistences,
being designated with names appropriated to
their own order of existence; the reasoning here
employed is as just and conclusive, as if the
divinity had actually sitten in council on the
death of Ahab, and the vision before us had
been a literal report of their debates and pro-
ceedings. That by, the host of heaven, nothing

except the angels of God can be meant, is the current opinion of the Jewish divines ; and, especially, of R. Moses Gerundensis.*

וצבא השמים
 שני המאוורות והכוכבים הנזכרים בענין ובן התשא
 עיניך השמיימה וראית את המשמש ואת הירח ואת
 הכוכבים כל צבא השמים נם יכלול השכלים
 הנבדלים בענין ראותו את ה' יושב על כסאו וכל
 צבא השמים עומדים עליו וככ' : “ But, the host
 “ of heaven, denotes the two luminaries, and the
 “ stars aforesaid; as in the text: *Lest thou lift*
 “ *up thy eyes unto the heavens, and view the*
 “ *sun, and the moon, and the stars, all the host*
 “ *of heaven. It will, also, comprehend the*
 “ *abstract intelligences; as in the text: I saw*
 “ *Jehovah sitting on his throne; and all the host*
 “ *of heaven standing by him, &c.*” That the
 individual spirit, which stood forward on this
 occasion, was but one of the many of which
 the council was composed, is expressly affirmed by
 R. Solomon Jarchi,†

ועתה יצא אחד מן המלאכים †
 ויאמר אני אפתנו כדאמ' עשה מלאכיו רוחות
 ולפיכך קדם ואמר לעיל וכל צבא השמים עומדים
 שאל תחמה כשתאמר ויצא הרוח מי הוא ומהיכן
 יצא וכשאמר וצבא השמים עומדים ברוי להודיע
 מהיכן יצא משאר הרוחות העומדים עליו :
 “ Now one of the angels came forth, and said ;
 “ I will persuade him : according to the words

* Com. Gen. ii. 1. † Com. in loc.

“ of the Psalmist; Who maketh his angels spirits: for which reason it is premised a little above; And all the host of heaven were in attendance; so that we are not to make it a matter of wonder, on its being said, And the spirit came forth, who he was, and whence he came; seeing that it is expressly declared, “ And all the host of heaven were standing, “ on purpose to manifest whence he came; to wit, from the rest of the spirits, who were standing by him.”

But the perfect incorporeity of angels is strenuously inculcated by R. Moses ben Maimon; * **ה מלאכים נ"כ איןם בעלי נשמי אבל הם שכלי נבדלי מהחומר אמנים הם עשווי והשם ברם כמו שיתבהיר:** Neither have angels bodies, but are intelligences abstracted from matter: nevertheless they were formed and created by God, as will be hereafter shewn.” To this assents R. Abraham ben Ezra: † **והעלין הוא על ה מלאכים הקדושים שאינם גופות ולא ב גופו בנשחת האדם:** “ But the celestial world is the world of the holy angels; who are neither bodies, nor yet included within bodies, like the soul of man.” So R. Moses Gerundensis: ‡ **מלאכי ה שם השכלים לא יראו לחוש הענין כי איןם גופ נחפש הנברלים לא יראו לחוש הענין כי איןם גופ נחפש**

* More Nevoch. Part I. c. xlix. † Com. on Ex. c. iii. v. 15.

‡ Com. Num. xxii. 23.

במראה : The angels of the Lord, being abstract intelligences, are not to be apprehended by the sight of the eyes ; as they are not a bodily substance, to be perceived by vision." So R. Joseph * ben Chajim : והמלאכי הם רוחניים ותר מהשמים שאין בהם נשים כלל angels are of a more spiritual nature than the heavens ; as they are perfectly incorporeal." So also R. Isaac Abarbinel : ואני כבר זכרתי שעם ¶ : היות שה מלאכים במוחותיהם הנבדלים מהומר אי אפשר שיושנו בחושים הנה ברצות ה' יראו לאנשים ווישגנו בחושיםם בצורת אדם וזה כדמות שאר הנפלאות But I have already observed, that, although angels, on account of their being wholly abstracted from matter, cannot possibly be perceived by the senses ; nevertheless, at the pleasure of Jehovah, they are seen of men ; and these behold them with their sensual organs in the human shape : an act, which is accomplished in a similar way with other miraculous appearances." Indeed so universal is the notion of their being abstract intelligences, that it would be labour in vain to dwell longer on the subject.

It will not avail us much, however, to have established their incorporeity or spirituality, if

* Yad Yoseph. fol. 115.

† Com. on Jud. c. vi. v. 12.

‡ More Nevoch. Part II. c. 4.

what R. Moses[†] affirms be true ; That, by reason of their incorporeity, they cannot, without being embodied, or standing in the correlation of cause and effect, be subject to number; or in other words, that the sameness of their substance neither does nor can exist in a diversity of persons. This impious paradox the author has indeed asserted, being carried away, as it should seem, by his too strong predilection for the Greek philosophy ; which has precipitated him not unfrequently into a train of reasoning verging on atheism, certainly terminating in a total denegation of the attributes of the godhead, and reducing its simplicity to a perfect non-entity. Swayed, however, by the authority of so great a man, even R. David Kimchi* has dilapsed into the same error : *וישעה לא ראה מניין לשרפים כי מצד עצמן אין להם מניין כי מה שאינו נור אין נופל תחת המניין אלא בעילותות ועלולים :* “Nor did Isaiah see a number of Seraphs ; “because in respect of their substance they have “no number ; for whatever is not body cannot be “numbered, but ranks in the predicament only “of causes and effects.” But how, I would ask, is this position to be defended ? Surely, not by contradicting almost every part of the inspired

* *Pereush Maase Mercava al Derech Hannister* ; subjoined at the end of his Com. on Ezekiel.

volumes, in which such frequent mention occurs of different and distinct angels appearing to the patriarchs and prophets, sometimes in groups, and sometimes in limited numbers; nor by denying, what the Talmudists have ever regarded as a most important truth, that the deity has a particular messenger for every particular errand; much less by arguing, that Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael, are but one and the same angel. Except, however, these extravagant and monstrous deductions may be tolerated, it will be incompetent to the advocates of Maimonides to defend his position. It is, indeed, so wholly repugnant to the general tenor of the sacred writings, and so abhorrent from the piety of both Jew and Christian, that the learned author himself, either forgetting what he had before advanced, or else postponing his philosophy to his religion, has absolutely maintained the contrary in his explication of the Cherubim.*

ואילו היה זה צורה אחת ויל צורת כרוב אחד היה בו הטעאה נס כנו
 שהוא חושבים שהוא צורת האל הנعبد כמו שהוא
 עושים ע"ש או שהמלאך הוא איש אחד נס כנו
 והיה מביא לקטת שנויות וכאשר עשה שני כרובים
 עם ביאור כי אלהינו יי' אחד יתבادر קיום הדעת
 במציאות המלאכים ושהם רבי' והוא העניין בטוח
 מתעות בהם בני אדם שיחשבו שהם אלוה אה'

* More Nevoch. Part iii. c. 45.

שְׁחַם אֶחָד וְהוּא בָּרָא אֶלָּו רַבִּים :
 “ But if there had been but one figure, that is, the figure of
 “ only one Cherub ; it might have given occasion
 “ easily to err. For in that case, one might have
 “ supposed, that it was an image of the Deity to
 “ be worshiped, according to the practice of the
 “ idolaters ; or that angel was but one individual,
 “ and so a number of errors might have ensued.
 “ But making two Cherubim, together with the
 “ declaration, The Lord our God is one God, he
 “ has placed beyond all doubt those articles of
 “ our faith ; That angels exist, and that there are
 “ many of them. He has, moreover, removed
 “ every ground of erring, or of thinking, as if
 “ they were God, by the declaration, That God
 “ is one ; and that he has made them many in
 “ number.” To this assents R. Joseph ben
 Jechia,* in his celebrated exposition of the pro-
 phet Daniel :
 זֶה אָמַרְתִּי נֶהֶר דֵי נָרָנָד וְנָפְקָח
 מִן קְדֻמּוֹתֵי מִפְנֵי שְׁחַם לְאַכְּבָים הֵם חֹזֶק מִמְּנוּ יְהִבְרָך
 וְלֹא אֶצְלָוּ כְּמוֹ כָּסָא הַכְּבָד וּפִירְשׁ כִּי הֵם לְאַלְפִּים
 וּרְבָבּוֹת בְּהַפְּקָד רַעַת הַפִּילּוֹס֋ופָ אֲשֶׁר כָּלָם בְּעֶשֶׂר
 עַלְוָת וְעַלְוָלִי :
 “ This is his meaning of the words :
 “ A stream of fire promanated and issued from
 “ before him ; that the angels exist apart from
 “ the deity ; and are not with him like the throne
 “ of glory. He further adds too, in explanation,

* Com. on Daniel, c. vii. v. 10.

“ that they amount to thousands and tens of thousands ; contrary to the opinion of the philosopher, who comprehends them all in ten causes and effects.” That there is a number, indeed, of angelic spirits, is the constant and uniform language of the Jewish Church ; and it is certainly matter of astonishment, that either Maimonides, or Kimchi, should deviate so far from the principles of their religion, as to inculcate a doctrine, which is in diametrical opposition to the authority of the fathers.

From angels, then, let us transfer our attention to the souls of men, the common spirituality of which, as existing in a number of subsistences, admits of being proved on still stronger evidence. For whether, in compliance with the vulgar opinions, we regard their original emanation from the soul of Adam, their transmigration into different bodies, or their habitation after death in the garden of Eden ; every thing conspires in favour of the argument, that in the common spirituality of men subsists a diversity of persons. The original emanation of every human soul or spirit from that of the primæval parent is thus attested by the prophet Malachi * וְלֹא אָחֵד עָשָׂה וַיֹּשֶׁר רוח לו : Did he not make one ; and had not he the residue of the spirit ?” That is, says

* C. ii. v. 15.

R. Solomon Jarchi,* וְלֹא אֶחָד עָשָׂה הַקָּבָה לְאָדָם and R. Ase,† אמר רַבִּי אָסֵי אִין בֶּן דָּוִד בָּא עַד שִׁכְלָוּ כָּל נְשָׁמוֹת שְׁבָנוֹת שֶׁנָּאָמַר כִּי רֹוח מִלְּפָנַי יַעֲטֹף וְנְשָׁמוֹת אֲנִי עֲשִׂיתִי פִּירּוֹשׁ נֹזֵף זֶה מָקוֹם הוּא שִׁישׁ בּוֹ כָּל נְשָׁמוֹת שְׁבָרָא הַקָּבָה לְבָנֵי אָדָם שַׁעֲתִירֵין לְהִיּוֹת בְּעוֹלָם עַל בֵּית מִשְׁיחָה : The son of David, says : R. Ase, does not appear till all the souls which are in the body, shall have had an end ; as it is said : For the spirit shall fail before me, and the souls which I have made. Here the term, body, is used for the place, in which are all the souls, that God created for the posterity of Adam ; and which are to exist in the world, before the coming of the Messias." That this subsisting condition of the human soul, previous to its union with the body, has ever been acknowledged by the Jews, as a sacred truth, is clearly

* Com. on Mal. c. ii. v. 15.

† Aruch. Guph.

asserted by R. Menasseh ben Israel.* Quod ad Hebræos attinet, qui dicunt, animas omnes olim in principio rerum omnium creatorum creatas esse; ex eorum opinione certum est, quod quemadmodum aliquot centenis annis animæ istæ felices ac beatæ fuerunt in glorioso isto suo statu, antequam informarent corpus: ita etiam post mortem tales esse possint, ac proinde opus non sit resurrectione mortuorum, qua corpori unitæ beatitudinem consequantur. “But as to the Jews, who assert that all the souls were created in the beginning of the world; according to their opinion, certain it is, that, as these souls were for some centuries in that glorious state of theirs, happy and blessed, before they were embodied; so might they be again after death: and, therefore, there is no need of the resurrection of the dead, whereby the souls united to the body may enjoy real happiness.” The subsequent account† of the manner in which the spirit is supposed to be united to the body immediately after conception, though bordering somewhat on allegory, is, nevertheless, in the main intended to be taken literally; and is extremely well adapted to support the present argument.

מִדְּ רֹמוֹ הַקִּבָּה לְמַלְאָךְ הַמִּמְונָת עַל הַרוּחוֹת

* De Res. Mort. Lib. ii. c. 19.

† Cited by Wagenseil, from an old Manuscript, but without further references.

ואומר לו הבא לי רוח פלוני שכך הם עושים בהבראם
 מיום שנברא העולם עד שיכלה העולם תכף בא
 לפניו הק"ב והמשתחו לפניו באותו שעה אמר לו
 הק"ב הכנס בטיפה זו מיד פותח הרוח את פיו
 ואמר לו רבונו של עולם דיו לי בעולם שהייתי מיום
 שנבראתי אם רצונך אל תכנסני בטיפה זו סРОחה
 כי קדושה וטהורה אני אל הק"ב העולם אשר
 אני מכניסך הוא טוב מן העולם אשר היה
 וכשיצרתיך לא יצרתיך אלא לטיפה זו מיד
 מכניסו הק"ב על ברחו בתוכו אותה טיפה :
 "Immediately God beckons to the angel, who
 "is set over the spirits, and says to him : Bring
 "me such a spirit. For this is the way they
 "always do, on being formed, from the day
 "that the world was created, till the world shall
 "be at an end. Presently, he appears before
 "Jehovah, and worships in his presence. Then
 "says Jehovah to him : Betake thyself into this
 "matter. Instantly, the spirit excuses himself,
 "and says to him : Governor of the world, I am
 "satisfied with the world, in which I have been
 "from the day that I was created. If it please
 "thee, don't oblige me to betake myself into
 "this putrid matter; for I am holy and pure.
 "Jehovah says to him : The world, into which I
 "am going to send thee, is better than the world
 "where thou now art; besides, when I formed
 "thee, I did not form thee but for this very

“ matter. Immediately God forces him, whether willing or unwilling, into the midst of the matter.”

Their continuation to subsist equally by themselves after death is not obscurely intimated by Solomon* the son of David: וַיֹּשֶׁב הַעֲפָר עַל הָאָרֶץ כַּשְׁהִיא וְהָרוֹת תָשׁׁוּב אֶל הָאֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר נָתַנָּה: “And the body shall return to the earth, as it was before; but the spirit shall return to God who gave it.” The meaning of which is amply dilucidated by the exposition of the Targumist: וַיְחַזֵּב בְּסֶרֶךְ דָּתָבְרִי מִן עַפְרָא עַלְיוֹ: “And thy flesh, which was formed from the dust, shall return to the earth just as it was at the first; but the spirit of thy soul shall return to stand at the bar of judgment before Jehovah who gave it thee.” Nor ought the ingenious remark of R. Abraham ben Ezra† to be omitted: זֶה הַפְּסִזְקָה יְחִישׁ הַאֲוֹמְדִים שְׁהָרוֹת הִיא מִקְרָה כִּי הַמִּקְרָה לֹא יִשְׁׁבּוּ: “This text refutes the assertion of those, who say, that the spirit is an accident; for that which is an accident cannot return.” But perhaps, to many the same inspired author§ may seem to furnish a still clearer intimation of their actual subsistency after death in the following text:

* Ecc. c. xii. v. 7. † Ibidem. ‡ Ibidem. § Ecc. c. iii. v. 21.

מי יודע רוח בני adam העלה הוא למעלה ורוח
 הבבמה הירדת הוא למטה לארץ : " Who regard-
 " eth, that it is the human spirit, which ascendeth
 " upwards ; but the spirit of a beast, which de-
 " scendeth downwards to the earth." That is,
 מי הוא אשר מבין ונוטן לב : says R. Solomon* ;
 שרוח בני adam היא העולה למעלה ועומדת בדין
 ורוח הבבמה הוא הירדת למטה לארץ ואין לה
 ליתן דין וחשבון וצדיק שלא להתנגד כבבמה
 שאינה מקפדת על משעיה : " Who is he that
 " considereth, and layeth to heart, that the spirit
 " of the children of men is that, which ascendeth
 " upwards, and standeth at the bar of judgment ;
 " but the spirit of a beast is that, which descend-
 " eth downwards to the earth, and hath not to
 " render either trial or account : and, conse-
 " quently, that it behoveth him not to live like a
 " beast which is not attentive to its actions."
 Moreover, R. Menasseh,† in illustrating a very
 important part of the Old Testament, has deduced
 from it this very position ; That the souls of men,
 after death, subsist separately and individually,
 and are not, as certain philosophers supposed,
 united to the Soul of the world. Secundo animas
 in se, et quatenus individua sunt immortalitate
 frui, et non uti Averroes aliique philosophi quidam
 sunt opinati, post separationem corporis, jungi

* Ibidem.

† De Creatione, p. 72.

intellectui agenti : ideo enim dicit, et erit anima domini mei, scilicet particularis, &c. "Secondly, "we learn ; that the souls of men in themselves, "and in their individual capacity, enjoy immor- "tality ; and are not, as Averroes and certain "other philosophers supposed, joined or united, "after their separation from the body, to the "soul of the world : for to this end is it said ; "And the soul of my Lord shall be, that is, the "individual soul, &c."

Thus from the preceding evidences, which might easily be increased in number, the truth of the position, that other spiritualities do exist in a plurality of persons, is established and fortified beyond the power of contradiction. For should it be doubted, whether angels are a spiritual substance of which each individual has a common participation ; or, whether, being generated in succession, they do not exist in the correlation of causes and effects ; such hesitation can never be entertained in respect of the spirits of men, which, severally emanating from the self-same cause, cannot possibly stand in any correlation of that kind ; but are independent of each other, and have relation only to the original subsisting spirit, from which they descended. Let us now, reasoning from analogy, apply what has been proved to the support of our leading position; and let us

put the question, Why the Deity may not exist in a plurality of persons ; or what there is to be found in the godhead, considered as a being perfectly incorporeal and spiritual, to prevent it from existing in a diversity of subsistences ; seeing that all the spiritual natures, of which we have the least notion, do really exist in this manner, and that without any relation whatever to bodily substance. The chief difficulty arising from our inability to comprehend, how an essence, wholly immaterial, can exist in number ; is here, by a comparison with what we actually know and believe of the numerical existence of both souls and angels, completely removed : nor is it a trifling preponderance in favour of our argument, that, when extended to the inferior orders of animated beings, the analogy still holds good ; as all the living creatures, with which we are acquainted, possess a sameness of form in a diversity of subsistences.

Maimonides,* however, interposes an assertion, which, if well founded, would entirely overturn the present argument. It is, indeed, no less than this ; that not even the most distant resemblance obtains between the divinity and the very highest of other spiritual beings ; and consequently, that no comparison whatever can be

* More Nevochim, Part i. c. 56.

instituted between them, either in respect of their essences, or in respect of their attributes. But why no comparison? Is it the infinity of the godhead that destroys all proportion? This is an insufficient ground on which to found the objection. For if by, infinity, be meant, what indeed is its proper signification, an interminability of essence, by reason of its incorporeity and spirituality; then the term is equivocal, denoting a property which the godhead retains in common only with other spiritualities: for neither may the angels or souls of men, by reason of such incorporeity or spirituality, be regarded as finite beings, or circumscribed essences. But if by, infinity, is to be understood an illimitation of wisdom and power; even that will not destroy all proportion between them: for as both angels and men can act with wisdom and energy to a certain extent, to deny totally their approximation to the divinity in the display of their wisdom and power, would be to grant that they possess faculties wholly different in kind from any that the Deity possesses, deriving their wisdom and power not from God, but from themselves; which would be a supposition as impious as it is absurd. I would not, however, that the matter should rest solely on my own reasoning. The Jewish divines abound with testimonies, warranting the proportion for which I contend. That

the higher any being ascends in intellectual perfection, the nearer it approximates to that of the Deity, is numbered by R. Judah Levita* among the first principles of theology : וְהַקְרָמָה הרבישות היהודאה כי למציאות מדרגות עליזנות ותתונות וכל מה שיש לו הרגש והשנה וחוש מעלה מאשר אין לו זה בעבר קורבתו ממורנת הסבה הראשונה אשר הוא השבל בעצמו : “ But the fourth principle, is the acknowledgment ; that of existent beings there are higher and lower degrees, and that whatever has feeling, perception, or sense, is superior to that which has them not ; because it makes a nearer approximation to the rank or degree of the first cause, which is intelligence by itself.” Comformably to this principle, the same learned author† has explained that celebrated text in Genesis concerning the formation of man so as to make the human nature approximate to the angelic, and the angelic to the divine. וְהַטְעָה כי כבר הדרנת היצירה והבאתיה על סדר החכמה מן היסודות אל המחזבים אל הצמחים אל החיה אשר באור ובמים ואחר כן אל החיה אשר בארץ בעלי החושים הוכים והידיעות הנפלאות ואין אחר המדרגה ההיא אלא מדרגה שהיא קרובה מן הסוג האלקי המלאכי והוא האדם בצורת מלאכי ומשרתיו הקרובים אליו במדרגה לא

* Sepher Cosri, Mem. v. p. 377.

† Ibidem, Mem. iv. p. 274.

במקום כי התעללה מהתקום : The meaning of the text is ; that hitherto I have proceeded with the creation by degrees, and according to the scale of wisdom have advanced it from the first elements, to minerals, to plants, to living creatures that are in the air, and in the waters ; and afterwards to the animals, which are on the earth, endued with the keenest sense, and most astonishing sagacity : nor is there any other degree or order of being beyond this, except that which is the next to the angelic and divine nature, namely, man ; who is in the form of the angels and ministers of God, that are next to himself in rank or degree, not in place, because he is exalted above all place."

R. Joseph ben Jechia* makes the angels closely attendant on the Deity, and that in consideration of their approaching to him in similarity of form. מהננו חנורים בכחם אופיו אשר הוא זך ונקי מכל סין והוא רמז לעולם המלאכים אשר הם נקיים מכל חמר ודמה היוחת חנורת האל להיותם בצד מה דומים אליו בפשיותם ומתדברים בו וسرיהם אל משמעתו : And his loins begirt with the gold of Uphaz, which is pure and free from all dross. This indicates the world of angels, who are free from all matter, and are here assimilated to the girdle of God; because they

* Com. on Dan. c. x. v. 5.

“in some measure resemble him in the simplicity
“of their essence; and, because, they adhere
“closely to him, and govern according to his
“direction.” But as to men, does not Moses say
repeatedly, that man was created in the form and
likeness of God? In what, then, did that form
and likeness consist? Certainly, not in his bodily
configuration altogether; but, as Maimonides*
himself very strenuously contends, in his mental
and intellectual faculties; that is, in his spiritual
or immaterial form, on which the faculties and
operations of the mind do severally depend. But
if the scriptures assert, that man was made in the
likeness of God, and that likeness be understood
by Maimonides himself of his spiritual or intel-
lectual form, with what colour of reason can ei-
ther that author, or any other person, maintain,
that there is no resemblance whatever between
the divinity and the very highest order of
spiritual beings; or, that all comparisons, thus
founded on analogy, must be false and absurd.
If man be in the likeness of the Creator at
all, it must be wholly in that conformity or
likeness, which obtains between the spirit of
man and the spirit of God; as the mind, which
is allowed to be the seat or center of our
intellectual faculties, is a term not different from,

* More Nevochim, part i. c. 1.

but synonymous with that of spirit. Besides, do not we read in the Talmud* of the many ways, in which the human soul resembles the Deity; so much so indeed, that the ancient fathers may well be thought to have considered it as a particle of the divine essence, and as standing in the same relation to it that a part does to the whole?

מה הק'בה מלא כל העולם אף הנשמה מלאה
 את כל הנוף מה הק'בה רואה ואין נראת אף
 הנשמה רואה ואין נראית מה הק'בה זו את כל
 העולם אף הנשמה זנה את כל הנוף הק"בה טהור
 אף הנשמה טהורה הק"בה יושב בחדרי הדרים
 אף הנשמה יושבת בחדרי הדרים: “As God
 “fills all the world, so does the soul fill all the
 “body; as God sees, but is not seen; so does
 “the soul see, but is not seen; as God nou-
 “rishes all the world, so does the soul nourish
 “all the body: God is pure, so also is the
 “soul pure; God abides in the most inward or
 “secret apartment, so does the soul abide in
 “the most inward or secret apartment.” Indeed
 the position, that the human soul is a par-
 ticle of the divine essence, is so generally
 admitted; that R. Moses Alshech,† on this
 ground alone, has contended for a certain
 degree of equality between man and his Maker.

הנideal לישאהבה נפשי לומר אם אמרת שאהבתך

* Massecheth Beracoth, Perek i.

† Com. Cantic. i. 7.

לא יצדק כי אין אהבה כי אם בין השווים ואין חקר
 לנבדותיך ואני עפר ואפר אך עשה בנין נפשי
 שאהבה אותך כי יש שווי מה כי חלק אלה ממעל
 היא ולמענה תופיעות תשפיע ומנפש ועד בשראות חפשט
 שפע טובך וזהו הנידח לי שאהבה נפשי אותך
 הקרוובת אליך ממוני כי אין דאהבה רק בבעל
 "Tell me, thou :
 "whom my soul loveth; that is, were I to say,
 "I love thee, it would be unjust; as there is
 "no love except between equals; but thy great-
 "ness is unsearchable; whereas I am dust and
 "ashes: do it, however, in behalf of my soul,
 "which loveth thee; as there is here some
 "equality; for it is a portion of the divine essence
 "from above; and, on its account, pour forth thy
 "light and influence; and so the emanation of
 "thy bounty will extend from the soul to the
 "body. This is what we are to understand by,
 "Tell me thou whom my soul loveth, it making
 "a much nearer approximation to thee than I do
 "myself; for there is no love except between
 "equals only, whereas it is a particle of the di-
 "vine nature from above." Seeing, then that
 this special objection of Maimonides is completely
 invalidated; I am left in full possession of the
 argument: That a plurality of persons in the
 godhead is only what reason suggests, and analogy
 dictates; on comparing spiritual things with

spiritual, and allowing for their different gradations of excellency and perfection.

CHAPTER III.

THE argument next in order, whereby the leading position is intended to be corroborated, is taken from the consideration, that every immaterial being, of which we retain any clear and well founded notion, is a real emanation from the godhead ; to the fecundity of which must be attributed all that number and variety of intellectual forms and subsistences, which either do now, or ever did appear in this stupendous university. The creation of material beings was doubtless, as both the Jews and the Christians aver, primarily from nothing ; but the origin of all spiritual essences was derived substantially from the godhead, as shall be demonstrated on evidences too great for exception. In the scriptures, indeed, we read of spirits having been made or created by God, as though they had formed a part of the material system ; but the term, creation, it ought to be observed, is highly equivocal, and does not generally mean, as R. Abraham* has very justly argued, the production of something out of nothing ; but

* Com. on Gen. Par. Bereshith.

most frequently the causing of a thing to subsist, without any regard whatever to the pre-existence of its matter. In treating this argument, I shall adopt the rules antecedently prescribed, in confining myself to the angelic and human natures ; whose real existence being less disputed than that of other beings, seems a sufficient ground of preference in the case before us, where exemplification and proof are equally necessary.

That angels originally emanated from the God-head the scriptures neither affirm nor deny. Indeed, except they may be comprehended under the general expression of the host of heaven, we possess no scriptural authority for maintaining, that they received their being at all ; or, that they did not exist, as they do now, from eternity : as no explicit declaration is to be found in the compositions of Moses of their having been created, or of their beginning to subsist coætaneously with the rest of the system. But this deficiency in the Mosaic account of the creation is amply supplied by early tradition,* which inculcates, not only that the angels were created ; but that they were created, either on the second day, according to R. Juchanan ; or on the fifth, according to R. Chanina. It deserves to be considered, however, that the term, angel, is highly equivocal ;

* Vid. Hoil Mosche, Perek 3.

being applied by the Jewish divines to denote the celestial spheres, as well as any thing besides, whether corporeal or incorporeal, that is employed as an agent in the curation of the worlds. But the peculiar acceptation of it in this work, and which has never been denied, is that of an order of intelligences wholly abstracted from matter; which, by reason of the transcendent dignity of their nature, attend immediately on the behests of the Deity, and approach the nearest to him in rank and degree. It is further to be remarked too, that this great university is usually divided by the Jews into three distinct worlds; into the intellectual, the planetary, and the lower world; the first of which is allotted to the purest intelligences, the second to the planets, and the last to men along with other living creatures. The intellectual being appropriated to abstract intelligences, is the only world with which this part of our work, that turns upon angels, has any thing to do.

To begin, then, with what the Cabbalists call the seven inferior numerations of the Godhead, the highest intelligences to which the term angel has ever been given; is it not unanimously maintained, that they all emanated essentially from the Deity, and do not differ from him in any other manner, than as the flames of a burning

coal may differ in substance from the coal itself? This doctrine of emanation will be fully illustrated by testimonies hereafter to be produced on a separate occasion, and may at any time be corroborated by an appeal to the Cabbalists in general; but particularly to R. Menasseh ben Israel,* to whom, as a most luminous and easy writer on a very dark and difficult subject, I shall refer the reader for more explicit information. That every immaterial power, however, or spiritual subsistency, is an actual emanation from the divinity, is plainly inculcated in the fourth of the thirty-two paths of wisdom, prefixed to that celebrated work, the Book of the Creation: **הנתיב** † **הד'** נקרא שכל קבוע ונקרא כן שמן מھאצלם כל הכוחות הרוחניות בדקות האצלות שמתאצלות אלו מלאו בכח המאצל הקדמון כ"ע ית' " The fourth way is called the receptacular intelligence; and is so termed, because from it emanate all spiritual powers by a subtilty of emanation, whereby they emanate one from another by virtue of the primordial emanator, the supreme being, blessed be he." R. Judah Levita,‡ commenting on the text of Sepher Jetsira, declares the spirit of God, or the Holy Spirit, to be the origin from which all angelic

* Concil. Quæst. xxviii. De Creatione Prob. xvi. et xxvii.

† Rit. Ed. p. 18.

‡ Sepher Cōsri, Mem. iv. p. 311.

spirits derived their subsistency ; and that the souls of men enjoy the most intimate communion with it ; וְהַקְדִּים רֹוח אֱלֹקִים וְהִוא רֹוח הַקְדֵּשׁ ; מִמֶּנָּה נִבְרָא אַמְלָאִים הַרוּחָנִים וּבָה מִתְהַבְּרוֹת הַנְּפָשֹׁת הַרוּחָנִיות : “ But he first mentions the : spirit of God, that is, the Holy Spirit ; from which are created the spiritual angels, and with which the spiritual souls enjoy the most intimate communion.” Similar to this is the declaration of R. Moses ben Maimon.*

שהשׁפע המנייע ממנה ותעללה להמציא שכלים נפרדים ישפע מן השכלים נס כנ להמציא קצחים את קצחים עד השבל הפעול ואצלו תפסק המצאת הנפרדים : “ For that influx, which flows from the Deity to the actual production of abstract intelligences, flows also from the intelligences to their production from each other in succession ; until that active intelligence, which is the soul of matter, be caused to exist : and with that terminates the production or creation of abstract intelligences.” Nor is the testimony of R. Joseph ben Jechia,† on this head, less clear and convincing :

והכונה כי הם מעצמות אותו האור אלהי שהוא מן כסא הכבוד ומפני כי הם נושאי הכסא שהוא נור דליק צרייך שידיו מתייחסים אליו ויהיו של אש כלומר אור זה אבל אין ספק כי אותו האור מהכסא הוא אור יותר מופלג מפני שהוא אצל יתרון ונאצל

* More Nevoch. Part ii. c. 11. † Com. on Daniel, c. vii. v. 10.

מן ראשונה ואחר כך נבראו המלאכי והיו שרים
ונחר די נור כלומר אור נمشך מהאור הראשון :

“ He means to say, that they are of the very
“ substance of that divine light, which is of the
“ same nature with the Throne of Glory: and,
“ because they are the supporters of the Throne,
“ which is flaming fire, they must needs be of a
“ kindred species with it, and be fire, that is, pure
“ light; though there can be no doubt, but that
“ the light of the Throne is a more transcendent
“ light, because it is with God himself, and eman-
“ nated from him the first of any; whereas the
“ angels were created afterwards, being seraphs,
“ and a stream of fire, that is, light drawn from
“ the first light.” But if their original emanation
from the godhead had been less generally attested
among the professors of Judaism, than we find
it is; we doubtless should have been led to draw
the conclusion, from the manner in which the
spirit of man was originally communicated to
him; it being a fair presumption; that if man,
who is confessedly inferior to the inhabitants
of heaven, derived his spirituality by way of
emanation from the supreme being, angels would
do the same; since they approach so much
nearer, than he does, to the form of the divinity.

Now the inspiration of the Almighty, whereby
man was made a living and intellectual sub-

sistency, was, strictly speaking, an emanation from the godhead ; and has ever been regarded as such by the highest authorities of the Jewish church. Indeed the history of his formation, as given by Moses,* precludes the possibility of deducing the soul from any other source : **וַיַּצֵּר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶת הָאָדָם עַפְرָם מִן הָאָדָם וַיּוֹתַחַם** “ And **בְּאָפִיו נְשָׁמָת חַיִם וַיָּבוֹא הָאָדָם לְנֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה :** “ God Jehovah formed man, a body from the “ ground ; and breathed into his nostrils a vital “ spirit, and man became a living creature.” The latter part of this pasuk is beautifully illustrated by Onkelos,† the paraphrast : **וַיְנַפֵּח בְּאֹפוֹהוּ נְשָׁמָתָא דְּחַיִם וְהַוֵּת בְּאָדָם לְרוֹחָם מְלֻלָּא** “ And he breathed into his nostrils the afflatus “ of life, and it became in Adam an articulating “ spirit.” The author of the book of Job‡ makes the soul of man the same with the spirit of God : **כִּי כָל עַד נְשָׁמָתִי בַּי וְרוֹחָם אֱלֹהִים בְּאָפִי :** “ For as long as my soul is in me, and the spirit “ of God is in my nostrils.” So on another occasion§ : **רוֹחָם אֱלֹהִים וְנְשָׁמָתָא שְׁדֵי תְּחִנֵּי :** “ The “ spirit of God made me, and the afflatus of the “ Almighty quickened me.” So again || : **רוֹחָם הִיא בְּאָנֹשׁ וְנְשָׁמָתָא שְׁדֵי תְּבִינָם :** “ Doubtless “ there is a spirit in man ; and the afflatus of the

* Gen. c. ii. v. 7.

† Ibid.

‡ C. xxvii. v. 3.

§ C. xxxiii. v. 4.

|| C. xxxii. v. 8.

“ Almighty causes them to understand.” That is, says R. Solomon :* *חכמתה ולא עי ימים* “ He has wisdom, *ווקנה אלא רוח המקור היא* : and that not by virtue of time and old age ; “ but it is the spirit of God.” The subsequent testimony,† however, may be looked upon as a full corroboration of this part of our argument : *אם ישים אליו לבו רוח ונשנתו אליו ואסף ינווע* “ If he were to set his heart against him, and were to take “ to himself his own spirit, and his own afflatus ; “ all flesh would expire at once, and man would “ return to dust again.” The doctrine is expressly maintained by R. Joseph ben Chajim,‡ in opposition to gentilism. *זה בא להם מרוע* סברתם *שסוברים שהנפש ורוח האדם הוא נצוץ הנגלי* “ *וְאַכְלָמָד* כיון *שרוחה האדם נצוץ מהנגלים.* *איך יאמינו* בזה *שהנגלים נבראו לצורך האדם* והודיעו *התורה* *שהם מוטעים* *ואינו כן אלא ורוח אליהם* *רוח האדם נצוץ וחלק אליהם היה מרחף* על פניהם *כשעדין לא היה רק* *בקמים* *במציאות שהנפשה קדום* *קדום בריאות השמים* *שהם אש ומים* : But this is the consequence of their “ erroneous opinion ; for they suppose, that the “ soul and spirit of man is a coruscation of the “ spheres ; and, therefore, since the spirit of

* Com. c. xxxii. v. 8.

† Job xxxiv. v. 14, 15.

‡ Yad Yoseph, fol. 6.

“ man is a coruscation from the spheres, how
“ should they believe in the doctrine, that the
“ spheres were created for the use of man?
“ The law, however, clearly demonstrates, that
“ they are in an error; that it is not a corus-
“ cation from the spheres, but that, on the con-
“ trary, the spirit of God, that is, the spirit of
“ man, a coruscation and particle of the Deity,
“ brooded over the face of the waters; that
“ whilst as yet nothing existed except what was
“ in the waters, the soul of man had an existence
“ anterior to the formation of the heavens, they
“ being nothing but fire and water.”

Thus having, by a variety of proofs, demonstrated the fecundity of the godhead, in that all spiritualities, of whatever gradation, have originated essentially and substantially from it, like streams from their fountain; I avail myself of this as another sound argument, that in the sameness of the divine essence subsists a plurality of persons. By the former argument was shewn the congruity of the position with what is admitted and believed of other incorporeal natures; but by this is evinced, in a qualified sense, the reality of the thing; in that every emanation from the godhead must needs be a personality of it, though not in its full form and likeness, nor yet in any degree necessary to its own being and

subsistency. Seth, in the opinion of Maimonides,* was begotten in the full and perfect image of his father, Adam ; but Cain was not, having vastly degenerated from that intellectual form, which was conferred on the parent. Nevertheless, Cain was a real subsistency of man as well as Seth ; though greatly inferior to him in point of perfection. So, if without detriment to piety great things may be compared with small, I would contend, that every intelligency, descending by way of emanation or impertition from the godhead, must needs be a personality of that godhead, from which it has descended ; only so vastly unequal to it in personal perfection, that it can form no part of its proper existency.

Nor ought it hereupon to be objected, that by the adoption of this argument I am paving the way for the admission of a multitude of divine persons, instead of a Trinity ; which is by no means the fact. The multiplicity of individuals in any common form is in no respect necessary to the existence of that form ; it being competent to it to retain its perfection, as well in a paucity, as in a variety of persons. No one, for instance, would make a doubt of it ; whether the form of man did not exist as perfectly in the primæval parents, when by themselves ; as it does now

* More Nevoch. Part. I. c. 7.

in eight hundred million of their surviving descendants. The question, however, so far as it affects the Deity, may be reduced to this. That all intellectual natures flow substantially from the godhead, and that they all equally rank in the predicament of created beings, is abundantly manifest. The only distinction, then, which it is particularly incumbent upon us to maintain between the godhead and each intellectual subsistency emanating from it, is, that the latter was created, and had a beginning, whereas the former is uncreated, and has subsisted from eternity; that the latter is contingent, and might not have subsisted, whereas the former is necessary, and must have subsisted; and this, be it observed, is the chief mark or characteristic, which distinguishes the godhead from other intelligences. But whether the proper personality of the godhead itself subsist in an unity or plurality of number, and if in a plurality, whether that plurality be a trinity; will be considered and determined in our attempt to prove, that the trinity is the only perfect and necessary number. In the interim it is no small gratification to reflect, that of the emanative and fructifying energy of the godhead, the actual being of so many intelligences, which have emanated from it; is at least a present, and even ocular demonstration.

CHAPTER IV.

I now proceed to the consideration of that argument, which results from the several names of the Deity, even the most sacred and proper, being common to many individuals, and that not unfrequently of different species; than which polytheism itself requires no firmer corroboration. It is not meant, however, along with these sacred appellations, to comprehend such terms as appear strictly metaphorical; much less the various epithets or attributes, which, having the construction of adjectives, do not stand by themselves, but accompany the nouns always to which they refer.

Now the names, by which the Deity is generally designated among the Jews, appear to be, אֱלֹהִים, Lord; אל, God; אלֹהָי, Deity; בָּרָא, Creator; עָשָׂה, Maker; צָרָא, Rock; שָׁדִי, Almighty; יְהָיָה, Being; and, יְהֹוָה, which, though it is evidently of verbal origin, and signifies perpetuity or constancy of being; yet, as it makes a much nearer approximation than any of the rest to a noun proper, may be suffered to retain its original form, and be pronounced, Jehovah, agreeably to the points. That they do not belong exclusively to any supposed subsistency of the godhead, but

carry in them the peculiar marks of common appellations, as well as stand for individuals differing in kind, is a matter of easy demonstration ; the characteristics for distinguishing proper from common names, as given by R. Elias Levita,* being first premised : **ונדע כי באربעה דברים** סמיכות רוצח לומר שלא יסמן לאחר כמו שתאמר מלך מצרים לא תוכל לומר משה מצרים : רבוי רוצה לומר שלא יתרבי לומר אברהמים יצחקים ודומיהם : כמו רוצה לומר שלא יבא בו כמו לומר אברהמן יצחקן ודומיהם : ידיעה פירוש שלא תבא בו הא" ידיעה לומר האברם המשה ודומיהם : " Observe, that a proper name differs from all other " sorts of names in four respects, the symbol of " which is, Sarci ; that is, construction, plurality " of number, affixation, and emphasis. Con- " struction, that is to say ; it cannot be joined " to another noun in regimen ; as though you " may say, king of Egypt, you cannot say, " Moses of Egypt. Plurality of number, that is " to say ; it cannot have the plural form ; as, " Abrahams, Isaacs, and the like. Affixation, " that is to say ; it cannot have an affix after it ; " as, Thy Abraham, thy Isaac, and the like. " Emphasis, that is ; it cannot take the em-

* Pirke Elihu, Per. Hamminim.

“ phatic and demonstrative The before it ; as, “ The Abraham, the Isaac, and the like.” Such being the true marks or characteristics, it remains only, that we apply them to the names under consideration ; and see, whether any of them can be regarded as strictly proper, or as limiting the godhead to an individual subsistency.

The term, אָדוֹן, Lord, is allowed on all hands to be common. It is, besides, employed to express other beings ; as will be rendered apparent from the subsequent examples : *וְסִכְרָתִי אֶת

מִצְרָיִם בַּיד אֲדֹנִים קָשָׁה וּמֶלֶךְ עֹז יִמְשָׁל בָּם נָאֵם
הָאָדָן יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת : “ And I will oppress Egypt :
“ by the hand of a cruel lord ; and a violent king
“ shall reign over them, saith the Lord Jehovah
“ בָּן יִכְבֹּד אָב וּעֲבָד אֲדֹנוֹ וְאָמֵן אָב .”
אַנְּיָה אַיִּה כְּבוֹדִי וְאָמֵן אֲדֹנוֹם אַנְּיָה מַוְרָאֵי אָמֵן
יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת : “ A son honoreth a father, and a
“ servant his master ; but if I am father where is
“ my honor ; or if I am master, where is my re-
“ spect, saith Jehovah of hosts ? ”
כִּי יְהוָה אֱלֹהִיכֶם ? “ For Je-
הָוָה אֱלֹהֵי הָאֱלֹהִים וְאֲדֹנֵי הָאֱדֹנִים :
“ hovah, your God, is God of Gods, and Lord of
“ Lords.”

The term, אֱלֹהִים, God, has all the characteristics of a common appellation. It is, indeed, highly

* Isaiah, c. xix. v. 4.

+ Malachi, c. i. v. 6.

‡ Deut. c. x. v. 17.

equivocal; being used not only for the Deity itself, but for the inferior intelligences; as the Jews confess, and as the annexed texts will abundantly manifest. **¶** **וְאַיִן עַמּוֹ אֱלֹהִים נָכֵר** “* There is no strange God with him.” **תְּהִלָּה הַנְּדֹול** “The great God.” **תְּזַהַּה אֵלִי וְאַנְהָה אֱלֹהִי אָבִי :** “This is my God, and I will adore him; the **אֱלֹהִים בְּאָלִים** “God of my father.” **מֵי בָּמְכָה** “Which of the Gods is like unto thee?”

The term, **אֱלֹהִים**, Deity, is as well equivocal as common. For though I cannot assent to the position of Maimonides,|| that it was primarily given to the judges of the land, then to angels, and last of all to God; yet for certain, it denotes, as R. Abraham ben Ezra[¶] has very properly observed; any kind of being that is not corporeal. That this is the fact, a few examples will put beyond all doubt. **כָּל עַצְיָה עַדְן אֲשֶׁר בָּנֵן הָאֱלֹהִים** “All the trees of Eden, which are in the garden of the Deity.” **תֹּכְבָּה אָמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים צָבָאֹת :** “Thus saith Jehovah, the God of hosts.” **תֹּהַיְשׁ אֱלֹהָה מִלְבָעֵד :** “Is there a God besides me?” **וְאַיִלְתָּה נִסְרֵךְ אֱלֹהִים נִסְרֹךְ** “The temple of Nisroch, his

* C. xxxii. v. 12.

† C. x. v. 17.

‡ Ex. c. xv. v. 2.

§ Ibid. v. 11.

|| More Nevoch. Part ii. c. 6.

¶ Com. on Ex. c. iii. v. 4.

** Ezek. c. xxxi. v. 9.

†† Jer. c. xxxviii. v. 17.

‡‡ Isaiah, c. xliv. v. 8.

¶¶ 2 Kings, c. xix. v. 31.

* אלֹהִים נָצַב בְּעֵדָת אֶל בְּקָרְבָּן אֱלֹהִים יִשְׁפְּטָנוּ " God. "
 " The deity standeth in the assembly of God ; he
 † אָמַרְתִּי " judgeth in the midst of Gods."
 " I said, ye are Gods ;
 אֱלֹהִים אַתֶּם וּבְנֵי עֶלְיוֹן בָּלְכָם :
 " and all of you children of the Most High."
 ‡ קָרְבָּנוּ עֲשֵׂה לְנוּ אֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר יָלְכוּ לִפְנֵינוּ
 " up, and make us Gods ; who may advance
 § אֱלֹהִיךְ יִשְׁרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר הַעֲלֹן " before us."
 " These are thy Gods, O Israel ;
 מְאָרֶץ מִצְרָיִם :
 " who have brought thee up from the country
 ¶ לֹא תָכְלֹו לְעָבֵד אֶת יְהוָה כִּי אֱלֹהִים " of Egypt."
 קְדָשִׁים הוּא :
 " Ye cannot serve Jehovah, for he is
 ¶ פָּאוּ לְנוּ מַיִן יִצְלְנוּ מִיד אֱלֹהִים " a holy deity."
 הַאֲדֹרוּם הָאֱלֹהָאָלָה הַם הָאֱלֹהִים הַמְכִים אֶת מִצְרָיִם
 " Woe to us ! Who will deliver
 " us from the hand of these powerful Gods.
 " These are the Gods, who smote the Egyptians
 " with every calamity in the desert."
 *: כַּאֲשֶׁר :
 " When the Gods
 התָשַׁׁע אַתִּי אֱלֹהִים מִבֵּית אָבִי
 " made me emigrate from the house of my father."

The term **ברא**, Creator, is but sparingly used
 in the sacred writings ; and never, I think, to
 express any other being than the Deity himself.
 It is, however, a noun common ; as will evidently

* Ps. lxxxii. v. 1.

† Ibid. v. 6.

‡ Ex. c. xxxii. v. 1.

§ Ibid. v. 4.

|| Joshua, c. xxiv. v. 19.

¶ 1 Sam. c. iv. v. 8.

** Gen. c. xx. v. 13.

*כִּי אָמַר יְהוָה : “ בְּרַאְךָ יַעֲקֹב וַיַּצְرֵךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל :” Thus saith Jehovah, “ thy Creator, O Jacob ; and thy fashioner, O Israel.” †זְמַר אֶת בָּרָאֵיךְ “ But remember thy Creators.”

The term **עֲשֵׂה**, Maker, is both equivocal and common ; but what seems most worthy of admiration is, that in the very texts, in which the Deity is exclusively the subject ; it is evidently used in the plural number. “‡כִּי בְּעָלִיךְ עֲשֵׂיךְ For thy makers are thy husbands.” §יִשְׁמַח יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּעָשָׂוֹ “ Let Israel rejoice in his makers.”

The term, **צָר**, Rock, seems to be a metaphor, or translation, borrowed from the material world to convey to us the notion of that being from whom, as from a parent rock, every created subsistency is hewn and descended. For this reason, it must needs be equivocal ; and, as the subsequent passages will shew, common to more individuals than one. “||הַצּוֹר תְּמִם פָּעָלוֹ The Rock whose work is upright.” ¶כִּי לֹא כָּצְרָנוּ צָרֵם “ For their Rock is not like our Rock.” **וְאָמַר “ And he shall say : “ Where is their God, the Rock in whom they trusted.”

* Isaiah, c. xlivi. v. 1.

† Ecc. c. xii. v. 1.

‡ Isaiah, c. liv. v. 5.

§ Ps. cxlii. v. 2.

|| Deut. c. xxxii. v. 4.

¶ Ibid. v. 31. ** Ibid. v. 37.

The term, **שדי**, Almighty, occurs but seldom. The following, however, may be given as examples. “**בכּוֹל שְׁדֵי**” * As an almighty voice.” **וְהִיה שְׁדֵי בְּצָרֶךְ** † And thy defence shall be al- “mighty.” ‡ **אָנָּי אֱלֹהֵי שְׁדֵי**.” “I am God Almighty.” R. Abraham ben Ezra expressly calls it a noun common; § **שֵׁם הַתְּאֵר וְתַּעֲמֵד תְּקִיף** “It is a noun “common, or a noun adjective; and signifies, “strong.”

The term, **יה**, Being, rarely occurs; but in the several places in which it does occur, it bears all the marks of a common appellation. ||**כִּי בְּיהָ** “For in the Being, Jehovah, “**יְהֹוָה צָר עֲלֹמִים** : “**יְהֹוָה אֱלֹהִי צָבָאות מֵכָמֹךְ**.” “**יְהֹוָה הָסִין יְהָ** : “**יְהֹוָה אֱלֹהִי צָבָאות מֵכָמֹךְ**.” “**יְהֹוָה הָסִין יְהָ** : “equal to thee, a powerful Being!” R. David Kimchi** thus explains it: **וּפִירּוֹשׁ בְּיהָ הַרְאָשׁוֹן** : “**שֵׁם תְּאֵר מֹרֶה עַל הַיּוֹת הַשְׁלָמָם מִתְּהָ** “**הַשְׁנִי יְהָ** “But as to the meaning: “of the terms, Jah Jehovah, the former is a noun “common, inculcating that the world is from him; “but the latter term, Jehovah, is a proper name.”

Finally, the term, **יְהֹוָה**, Jehovah, though generally regarded by the Jews as a noun appropriated

* Ezek. c. i. v. 24.

† Job, c. xxii. v. 25.

‡ Gen. c. xvii. v. 1.

§ Com. on Gen. c. xvii. v. 1.

|| Isaiah, c. xxvi. v. 4.

¶ Ps. lxxxix. 8.

** Com. on Isaiah, c. xxvi. v. 4.

to the individual subsistency of the godhead; is also common to many persons: for being found in construction, and accompanied with adjuncts restraining its signification; it necessarily ceases to be proper. Thus we read: *בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא יְהֹוָה יְהֹוָה אֶחָד וְשַׁם־אֶחָד: In that day there shall be Jehovah only, and his name only." †שְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל יְהֹוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְהֹוָה אֶחָד: "Hear, O Israel, the Jehovah, our God, is the only Jehovah." ‡יְהֹוָה צָבָאות: "The Jehovah of hosts." Nay, R. Abraham ben Ezra § confesses, that when thus placed in regimen with the term, hosts, it partakes of the nature of a common appellation: וְהַנָּה מֵצָאנוּ יְיָ צָבָאות וְהַוּצְרָכוּ רַבִּים: "Loomer כי צָבָאות שם העצם הַוָּא אוֹ הוּא אֶת־צָבָא שלו וְזֹה לֹא יִתְכַּן כי הַנָּה אֱלֹהִי הַצָּבָאות וְלֹבְדוֹ לֹא תִּמְצָאנוּ כי אִם עִם אֱלֹהִים אוֹ עִם הַשֵּׁם הַנְּכָבֵד יְיָ אֱלֹהִים וְאֶל יִקְשָׁה בְּעִינֵּךְ יְיָ אֱלֹהִים צָבָאות כי הַוָּא כְּדָרֶךְ וְהַנְּבוֹאָה שָׁוֹدֵד הַנְּבִיא וּבְעִבּוּר שְׁהַשֵּׁם שָׁוֹכוֹן עַד עֲומֵד לְבָדוֹ וּבוֹ הַכָּל עֲומֵד עַל כֵּן פָּעֵם הַוָּא וְהַשֵּׁם כְּמוֹ תָּאַרְךְ דָּרֶךְ וּזְכָרֵר יְמִינֵּי עַלְמֵי מָשָׁה עַמּוֹ וְהַטָּעֵשׂ שַׁהְוָא הַמְעִיד: "It is worthy of remark, however, that we find, Jehovah of hosts, an expression which has led many to assert, that the term, צָבָאות, hosts, is itself a proper appellation of the deity; or, that it is

* Zech. c. xiv. v. 9.

† Deut. c. vi. v. 4.

‡ Jer. c. xlix. v. 26, et passim.

§ Com. on Ex. c. iii. v. 15.

“ a sign in his army : but this is highly impro-
 “ bable ; for we meet with the construction, God
 “ of the hosts ; where it is evidently a noun
 “ common : nor is it ever to be found standing
 “ by itself for, God ; but only with the term,
 “ Elohim, or with the compound term, Jehovah
 “ Elohim. Nor ought it to be considered as any
 “ objection, that we once read, Jehovah Elohim
 “ Sabaoth ; as that is of a similar complexion
 “ with the text : The prophecy of Oded the
 “ prophet ; where, in the original, the constructive
 “ form of the first term, prophecy, is equally dis-
 “ regarded. But seeing that the deity abideth
 “ for ever self-existent, and every thing is depen-
 “ dent upon him ; it will therefore occasionally
 “ happen, that, Jehovah, will be as it were a
 “ common appellation, like, Moses, in the pas-
 “ sage : And he shall remember the days of old
 “ time, the Moses of his people ; and, in that
 “ case, it must denote to the noun, with which
 “ it is in regimen, the causation of subsistency.”
 But besides being found in construction, and
 having other marks of a noun common ; it is
 absolutely equivocal ; angels being called by this
 name, as well as the deity. Thus, when the
 angel of God appeared to Moses in the bush,
 we read : **וַיַּרְא יְהוָה כִּיסֵּךְ לְרָאוֹת** :* “ And Je-

* Ex. c. iii. v. 4.

“ hovah saw, that he was turning aside to look.” Here R. Abraham* observes : וַיַּקְרֵא הַמֶּלֶךְ בְּשָׁם הַנְּכָבֵד כִּדְרֵךְ כִּי שְׁמֵי בְּקָרְבּוֹ וְשֵׁם אַפְרִישָׁנוּ וְכֵךְ : הַמֶּלֶךְ שְׁנָרָא לְגָדְעָן וְשֵׁם כְּתוּב וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ יְיָ : “ But the angel is called by the name, Jehovah; “ according to the declaration : For my name is in “ him; where I shall explain the matter more “ fully. In like manner, with respect to the angel “ who appeared to Gideon; it is there written : “ And Jehovah said to him.” Moreover, the prophet Zechariah† supplies a singular testimony of this complexion, וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל הַשְׁתִּין יָגַע : “ And Jehovah said to Satan: “ Jehovah reprimand thee, O Satan.” That the former, Jehovah, is spoken of the angel employed in this transaction, is expressly affirmed by R. David Kimchi:‡ וַיֹּאמֶר הָא הַמֶּלֶךְ וַיַּקְרֵא : “ בְּשָׁם רַبּוֹ וְכֵן בְּדָבֵר גָּדְעָן וּבְמִקְמוֹת אֶחָר : “ Jehovah said, that is, the angel who is called by “ the name of his master; and so we find the “ name used in the affair of Gideon, and in other “ places.” Nor is this any modern opinion of the Jews; on the contrary, it was the generally received notion of the ancient Fathers, as appears from what is recorded of R. Simeon ben Lakis, who was wont to maintain it on scriptural authority. וַיֹּאמְרוּ רֹזֵל כִּי שְׁמֵי בְּקָרְבּוֹ אֵד שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן לְקִישׁ

* Com. on Ex. c. iii. v. 4.

† C. iii. v. 2.

‡ Com. Ibid.

מלמד שהקב"ה משותף שמו על כל מלאך ומלאך:^{*}
 “But our Fathers of blessed memory assert, that
 “the words, for my name is in him, inculcate,
 “according to the opinion of R. Simeon ben
 “Lakis; that Jehovah communicates his name
 “to every angel whatever.”

Finally, not only the angels, but even the Messias, the Saints, and the city of Jerusalem, for reasons not necessary to be urged in this part of my work, bear the name of Jehovah; and that not by way of proposition or accommodation, but because of the actual relation and affinity which they are said to have and maintain to the essence of the Supreme Being. The fact is thus attested וְהַנָּה אֶלְעָזָר אֲרִישׁ בֶּן נָחָמִן:†
 שלשה נקראו בשמו של הקב"ה צדיקים ומשיח
 “Behold our Rabbies of blessed memory, on the authority of R. Samuel Nachmanides, assert, that there are three things
 “which are called by the name of Jehovah, the
 “Saints, the Messias, and the city of Jerusalem.”

Thus, the most sacred appellations of the divinity, being proved to be common and equivocal, furnish an argument which tends strongly to establish the leading position; in that it makes, either for polytheism, vulgarly so called; or for the pluripersonality of the godhead, according

* Kimchi on Josh. c. vi. v. 2. † Com. Jer. xxiii. 6.

to the trinitarian hypothesis; or for both the doctrines taken together. Now, if by, polytheism, may be understood the generation of a number of inferior deities from a common parent or chief god, which, I think, is all that can be fairly charged on the Pagans; who, though they assigned to their gods distinct parts in the management and government of the world, yet never regarded them as coequal and coeternal, but deduced their origin always from some parent divinity; if this, I say, be polytheism, then is it to be found among the professors of Judaism, who ascribe to their angels precisely what the Pagans ascribed to their secondary gods; nay, in this sense of the term, the Christians too must needs be polytheists; for St. Paul speaks of gods many, and of lords many; which can be meant only of such intellectual agents as are honored with divine names and titles, and are spoken of as gods and lords, in the holy scriptures. The grand distinction between the three sorts of worshippers seems to be this; that the Pagans pay adoration to the secondary gods; whereas the others do not, but consider them as creatures merely of a superior rank. But, though the communication of the names of the deity to the various subsistences of the intellectual world be sufficient to account for those names being used in the plural number; yet does it fur-

nish no reason, why any of them should retain that form, when spoken of God only; unless it be admitted, that in the sameness of the godhead subsists a plurality of persons. That they do, however, occur in this manner, is apparent from the examples already adduced. The term, Elohim, though found in the singular above seventy times, and consequently has a singular to be used; is, nevertheless, for the most part plural, and that when the deity himself is exclusively the subject. Mark that text of Moses, in the very threshold of the Pentateuch; where the deity is mentioned in the plural number, when as yet neither the heavens, nor the earth was created; and, consequently, no intellectual subsistency or angel, with whom he could be associated. Consider the passages from the Psalmist, in which the Supreme-Being, though expressed in the plural, is eminently distinguished from the secondary gods or angels, and contrasted with them in the most striking point of view. But what still more particularly deserves to be noticed, is the plural form of, Maker, and Creator, in the cited texts, from Solomon and Isaiah; where it would be the highest impiety not to interpret them solely of the deity himself, the only Maker and Creator of the universe.

I know, indeed, that the Rabbinical school is

wont to term those plurals, **לְשׁוֹן כָּבוֹד**, **לְשׁוֹן רְבָנוֹת**, or, **לְשׁוֹן רְבָנוֹת**, an honorary or complimentary form of speech; and that R. Abraham * in particular contends for this being a peculiar idiom of the sacred dialect. But even admitting, that, in speaking of a superior, it is an idiom of the Hebrew to employ the plural instead of the singular number; some reason ought to be assigned, why it first originated with the ancient Hebrews. The various idioms of other languages, whether ancient or modern, may always be explained on philological principles. Now if this be really an idiom of the Hebrew dialect, it seems difficult to account for it on any other grounds, than that Moses, as well as Pythagoras, regarded number as the perfection of all form; and that to distinguish a superior from an inferior person, but especially the deity from all other beings, he used the plural instead of the singular number. This I say, not with the view of corroborating the opinion, but merely to shew; that, if the pretended idiom existed, the very reason justifying the adoption of it, would justify a belief in the trinity of the godhead. No reader, however, tolerably conversant in the Hebrew scriptures, will be so bold as to assert, that this is an idiom of the inspired penmen. It

* Com. on Gen. c. i. v. 1.

is, indeed, a most unsatisfactory way of accounting for the plurals in question ; and, that it did appear so to R. Abraham himself, is pretty evident from his being glad to subjoin as another reason, why the term, Elohim, should be used so constantly in the plural form : That God is so styled on account of his work being performed by the ministration of angels ; which, though admitted as a fair reason in all cases, where angels may seem concerned, is no reason at all for the use of it in those texts, from which, as subjects, they must of necessity be excluded. The opinion, however, has been so ably confuted by R. Isaac Abarbinel,* that I shall certainly avail myself of his learning and authority :

ונם דבריו אלה בלתוי מהוורים הם במש שם אליהם הוא רבים דרך נכבוד לפי שמצוינו זה השם בלשון רבים נאמ' נם על הדברי' שמנעם השם מכבר לא יהיה לך אליהם אחרים על פני זובח לאלהים וחרם ולא בא הכתוב לכבד את הפסילים ואין לומר שקראים כן כפי מהשבת עבדיהם עד והאנשים רדפו אחרים כי הינה התרור באזהרתה שלא יעבדו עכ"ז לא היה ראוי שתכבד' כפי מהשבת השכלים והעדר אמרו זובחו לשדים לא אלהים לא ודען שהביהתו מנהה אותם קראם אליהם והוא המוכיה שלא נאמר אליהם בלשון רבים לכבוד ולתפארת כל שכן שבלשון שינהנו לומר דרך נכבוד לנဂול בלשון רבים שהוא בלשון עם לווע איןנו כי

* Com. on Gen. c. i. v. 1. p. 5.

אם בשידרכו לנдол לנכח או ידברו אליו בלשון
 רבים כאלו הוא שווה לאנשים רבים זולתו אבל
 בדברים נסתה בזכרם נдол לא יאמרו עליו בלשון
 רבים ועוד שם היה הרבוי בשם האלהות כבוד
 לשם מודיע לא מצאנוהו באחד משאר שמותיו
 ותברך אלא בשם אלhim לא מהבלתי נמחקים ולא
 מהנמחקים כי בהיות הרבוי כבוד לשם כל שמותיו
 וכל בינויו היה ראוי שיוכרו בלשון רבים ואני
 כן נס מה שאמיר שבבעור היהת מעשה השם על
 ידי המלאכים נקרא אלhim הוא גם כן בלחתי נכון
 לפישתחיב מזה שהוא שם אלhim שנזכר בפסוק
 הראשון מהתורה נאמר על המלאכים והוא שקר
 מבואר שהברואת הראשונה מהסבה הראשונה
 ותברך היהת מבלתי אמצע לא מהמלאכים שהם
 מכל נבראין : But truly this statement of the
 author, that the term, Elohim, is used in the
 plural form by way of honour, is, in my
 opinion, without the least colour of truth or
 probability : as we find it in the plural number
 predicated of things, which God expressly
 forbids to be honoured. Thus, Thou shalt have
 no other Elohim before me ; Let him, who sacri-
 fices to Elohim, be accursed. Now the scripture
 is not wont to honour idols or sculptured images.
 Neither can it be alleged, that they are so
 styled in compliance with the erroneous ideas of
 their own worshipers, in the sense we read the
 passage : And the men pursued after them : for

“ surely, the law, when it had warned the people,
“ that they should not do service to the objects
“ of idolatry, was not going to honour them by
“ a compliance with the notion of their being
“ real intelligences. The truth of this assertion
“ is apparent from the text: They sacrificed to
“ devils, not to God; but to Elohim whom they
“ knew not; where it is worthy of remark, that
“ the inspired penman, though he is in the very
“ act of reviling and debasing them, yet styles
“ them, Elohim; a certain demonstration, that
“ the term is not used in the plural number to de-
“ note the greater honour and respect. Much less
“ is it true with regard to any language, in which
“ it is customary to address a superior in the
“ plural by way of reverence; as is the case in the
“ languages of Europe. For it happens only
“ when they speak to a superior in the second
“ person, that they apply to him the plural form;
“ as though he were equal to many single ones in
“ his stead. But in subjects of the third person,
“ should they chance to mention a superior, they
“ do not speak of him in the plural number.
“ Besides, if plurality of number in a name of
“ the Deity were to add honour to that name, why
“ do not we find it in some other of his names, as
“ well as in, Elohim; either of those which, being
“ wholly sacred, are not allowed to be erased;

“ or of those which may be erased. For on the
“ supposition, that plurality of form gives lustre
“ to an appellation, all the appellations of God,
“ together with their suffixes, ought to have been
“ used in the plural number: whereas the con-
“ trary is the fact. Moreover, with respect to the
“ position, that God is called, Elohim, in the
“ plural, on account of his work having been
“ performed by the instrumentality of angels; that
“ likewise is destitute of probability. For from
“ this it would follow of necessity, that the, Elohim,
“ which is used in the first verse of the book of
“ Genesis, is meant of the angels; which would
“ be in the highest degree erroneous, as the pri-
“ mary creation originated solely from the first
“ cause, without any instrumentality, and not from
“ the angels, who were themselves but a part of
“ the general creation.” Such are the arguments
of the illustrious Abarbinel, which I have been
the more anxious to give at full length; because
the futility of the answers of R. Abraham being
once acknowledged, the other opinions, not ex-
cepting even that of Abarbinel himself, are much
too frivolous to occupy any time in attempting to
confute them.

R. Judah Levita* alleges, that the reason
why the term is so generally used in the plural

* Sepher Cosri, Mem. iv. p. 250.

number, is because the idolaters were accustomed to make themselves images, in each of which they supposed a particular divinity to reside; and, consequently, were led to denominate them in the aggregate, Elohim, Gods; by whom they swore always, as exercising dominion over them from their power in the spheres. But if this be the true reason, then it follows of necessity, that the language of the scriptures is the language of idolatry, and that the worship of images was the primæval religion. This, however, is an inference to which, I am sure, neither the Jew nor the Christian will patiently submit; and, therefore, I shall conclude my remarks on this notion of R. Judah in the words of Abarbinel,* ודבריו אלה : באמת הם יותר מדבריו זולתו כלם : “ This account of the author is, in fact, more in- “ explicable and unintelligible, than that of any “ other writer, who has handled the subject, be- “ sides himself.”

Neither is the assertion of R. Solomon † and others, That the plural noun, by being associated with verbs and adjuncts in the singular number, is divested of its plural import; entitled to any higher regard. In Greek, a noun of the neuter plural is usually associated with a verb singular; and yet, no scholar would contend, that, because

* Com. on Gen. c. i. v. 1.

+ Com. on Gen. c. i. v. 26.

the verb is of the singular number, the noun does not actually express a plurality of subsistences. But it is by no means the fact, that the plural term, Elohim, when used for the true God ; is accompanied with verbs and other adjuncts always, in the singular number. The account which the patriarch gives of his being induced to leave home ; the solemn attestation of Joshua in his address to the Israelites ; the exclamation of the Philistines on beholding the ark of Jehovah ; the solicitation of the children of Israel to supply the vacancy of Moses by the symbol of a calf ; together with their subsequent declaration respecting its divinity ; not to mention other instances, unnoticed in this work, do certify the contrary. I confess, indeed, that both Onkelos and Jarchi interpret the latter passages of an idolatrous worship, into which the children of Israel, at the instigation of the strangers who were mixed along with them, had unhappily fallen : but R. Abraham,* I think, has most ably defended his countrymen from so grievous a charge, and plainly demonstrated the supposition of their idolatry to be a monstrous absurdity. For how could they, who had been led to look upon Aaron as the near relation and chief coadjutor of Moses, solicit him to make for them the symbol of any other deity,

* Com. in loc.

than that which they had previously adored ; and which had so frequently displayed its energy in extricating them out of embarrassment, and protecting them from danger ? How should they think of continuing in authority a man who had been so instrumental in promoting the worship of Jehovah, if the design of this transaction were an innovation in religion ? Nay, does not their subsequent conduct plainly prove to us, that it was no such thing ? for no sooner was this representation of the divinity finished, than they reared an altar, offered sacrifices, and celebrated a festival to the honour of Jehovah ; which evinces beyond all doubt, that it was not any defection from his worship at which the deity appeared so highly incensed, but their going contrary to his express command, in making for themselves an idol ; and in concluding with those of the Sabeans persuasion, that, as Moses had now disappeared, and forsaken them ; their God would surely vouchsafe to dwell in so sacred and splendid a symbol. That this is the true and proper light in which the transaction ought to be viewed, is the decided opinion, not only of Aben Ezra, but also of Nachmanides ; who has stated his sentiments on this point in the manner subjoined.* *ויאמרו אלה אליהיך נס זה הכתוב יורה אותה כי אין ישרא אשר העלו נס זה הכתוב יורה אותה כי אין*

* Com. in loc.

טפש בעולם שיחשוב כי הזהב הזה אשר היה
באוניהם הוא אשר הוציאם ממצרים אבל אמרו כי
כה הזרה הזאת העלים ממש והנה לא תמצא שיאמר
בענל בשום מקום אשר הוציאינו ממצרים כי הם מודים
במי שאמר אני ה' אלהיך אשר הוציאיך מארץ
מצרים כי שמו הנדול הוא המוציא אותן משם אבל
יאמרו במקומות רבים כי יקחו זה במקומות
היד הנדולה המחרבת ים. השמה עמוקי ים דרך
לעברנגולים וזהו שנאמר ימייראות כבודם בתבנית
שור ואכל עשב ושם נאמר שכחו אל מושיעם שעשה
גדולות במצרים נפלאות בארץ חם נראות על ים
סוף שכחו דברו אשר צום והנה עברו על לא תעשה
לך אלהים אחרים על פני כאשר רמזתי שם :

“ And they said : These are thy gods, O Israel,
“ which have conducted thee. This passage of
“ itself ought to be sufficient to guide your
“ judgment. For there cannot be a man in the
“ world so stupid as to suppose, that the gold
“ which had been on their ears, was actually the
“ being that had brought them up out of Egypt ;
“ but what they meant to say was, that the virtue,
“ or divine energy, of this form had conducted
“ them thence. Nor, indeed, can you find it in
“ any passage affirmed of the calf : Which hath
“ brought us up out of Egypt. They made their
“ confession in him, who had previously said :
“ I am the Lord, thy God, who brought thee up
“ out of the land of Egypt ; as it was his great

“ and glorious name, that had brought them up
“ thence. But they say in several places:
“ Which have conducted thee; Because they
“ took this instead of that majestic hand, which
“ had dried up the waters, and rendered the
“ depths of the sea a road for the redeemed to
“ walk in. This, too, is corroborated from the
“ words of the Psalmist: And they changed their
“ glory into the image of an ox that eateth grass;
“ where it is further said: They forgot the God
“ who rescued them, who achieved stupendous
“ feats in Egypt, miracles in the land of Ham,
“ awful sights by the Red Sea; they forgot the
“ word of him who had commanded them.
“ Their crime was, doubtless, this; that they
“ transgressed against the commandment, Thou
“ shalt not make to thyself any other gods before
“ me; as I have already insinuated, in my re-
“ marks on that commandment.” In support of
this interpretation, many other authorities might
be alleged to shew, that the Israelites were by
no means so stupid and void of understanding as
to suppose, that the dumb idol itself had any
power to assist them; but that in concurrence
with the then prevailing opinion amongst mankind,
that the deity vouchsafed to manifest his energy
through the medium of symbols, they believed,
that Jehovah their God would deign to display

as created form
his power in this golden calf, and so worshiped the idol in consideration of the divinity which dwelt within it, that is, the Habitation; as the learned R. Joseph* ben Chajim has very properly explained it. To this Sabean notion is to be referred the enthusiastic shout of the barbarous hosts, at the sight of the ark; who knew equally with ourselves, that the ark itself was no God; but naturally supposed it to be the symbol, in which the Israelitish divinities had deigned to dwell; just as the Israelites themselves had presumed with respect to the calf; or as Jehovah has described his own habitation between the two Cherubim: and this sentiment both the Israelites and the Philistines seem to have expressed in such a manner as to manifest their belief, that in the deity, Jehovah, subsisted a number of personalities.

Precluded then from the possibility of reconciling this plural term with their well known ideas of the unity of the godhead; it ought not to excite surprise, if there should even be found some of the Jewish expositors, who maintain that it is singular. Such was the opinion of R. Moses Gerundensis.† He has deduced the term from, **־יְהוָה**, god; and, **־יְהוָתִים**, they; supposing it to comprehend in its signification all spiritual powers

* Vid. **Yad Yoseph**, fol. 177. † Vid. **Abarbinel**, on Gen. c. i. v. 1.

and virtues, whatever, originating from the deity; and has defined it, as if it were written—**מְאֵל הָם**—They exist from God. But to this it is well objected by the learned Abarbinel,* that he has assigned no reason for the omission of the Mem, in the beginning, so necessary to the sense which is here affixed to it; nor why the Jod, contrary to all propriety, should be inserted in the middle; and still less reason, why in every case of affixation it should be treated as a plural. The notion, moreover, is repugnant to the authority of the Masorites; who, by placing the Holem point to direct the pronunciation, clearly manifest the opinion of antiquity, that, **אֱלֹהִים**, was written defectively for, **אֱלֹהִים**, the plural form of, **אֱלֹהָה**, the deity.

The same arguments nearly will hold good with respect to Abarbinel himself; who thinks it a compound of, **אֱלֹהָה**, and **יְה**, signifying the god, Jah; and so urges† by way of recommending the hypothesis, that nothing will be found to have been created without the express mention and agency of this Jah. He instances Ephraim, Metsraim, Chilaim, and Chushim, as proofs, that the termination, *im*, does not necessarily signify many; and regards the Mem as added, in the present case, to distinguish the absolute from the construct form. But this is a specimen of rea-

* Vid. Abarbinel on Gen. c. i. v. 1.

† Ibidem.

soning unworthy of the great Abarbinel. There is in the first place a strange and unprecedented transposition of the two letters, He and Jod; in order to form from, אלהֵי, the term, אלהֵי ; as the author proposes. The instances adduced are by no means in point; being all of them proper names, and never used either with an affix or an emphasis, like the noun Elohim. Neither has he assigned any reason, why this alone of all the names of the Supreme Being should be accompanied sometimes with verbs and adjectives in the plural number. The most evident cause of complaint, however, is, that contrary to the established usage of the language, he derives, by the addition of a Mem, a singular absolute from a singular construct form. Indeed the author himself appears to be dissatisfied with his own opinion; and, as though he foresaw, that it would not carry conviction to the mind of the reader, has endeavoured to account for this plurality in another way; by comparing the deity with the soul of man, in respect of the number and variety of its operations. But here the wonted perspicacity of the author has again deserted him. For though it be very true, that we observe resulting from the self same mind of man a variety of actions and operations, without ever calling in question the singularity of its

number; yet does that add nothing to the support of his argument, because in no language with which we are acquainted, is the human mind ever expressed in the plural number on that account; and, therefore, affords no reason why the noun, Elohim, should be so used, on account of the multiplicity and variety of its operations.

It remains, then, that we contemplate this appellation of the deity as being actually in the plural number, agreeably to both grammar and analogy; and as expressing a number of persons in that Godhead, to which it is rightly and for the most part appropriated. I have been the more particular in setting forth the grounds of the present argument in general, and above all this last circumstance, the evident plurality of the term, Elohim: for it appears to me, that by fairly demonstrating, that the different names and epithets, belonging to God, are spoken and predicated of him, rather as a form or species of being, than as an individual subsistency; we make a considerable advance towards the truth and confirmation of our second proposition.

CHAPTER V.

THE final argument, with which the leading position was submitted to be closed, is drawn

from the deity being observed not unfrequently to speak of himself in the first person plural. This, indeed, is so natural and popular a way of arriving at the conclusion; that, to most of the defenders of the trinitarian hypothesis, it has seemed the only thing necessary to be urged and maintained. Though not the only, it is certainly a very cogent argument; as will shortly appear from the worthless and futile attempts, which have been made, to diminish its prepossessing.

The following are the most remarkable of those passages, in which the style of speaking now alleged by way of argument is found to occur.

***וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים נָשַׁא אָדָם בָּצָלְמָנוּ כְּדֹמֶת נָשָׁנוּ** : “And God said: Let us make man in our own image, according to our own likeness.”

†**יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים הִנֵּה אָדָם כִּי־בְּאֶחָד מִמֶּנוּ לְדֹעַת טֹב וָרָע :** “And God Jehovah said: Behold the man is as one of ourselves, in the knowledge of good and evil.”

‡**הִבָּה נָרְדָה וּנְבָלַח שְׁמַשְׁפָתָם :** “Come, let us descend, and there confound their speech.”

§**וְאַשְׁמַע אֶת קֹל אֲדֹנִי אָמַר אַת מִי אֲשֶׁלָּה וְמִי יַלְךָ לְנוּ :** “And I heard the voice of my Lord, saying: Whom shall I send, or who will go for us.”

That the deity is actually the speaker in all the foregoing passages, is universally allowed; the

* Gen. c. i. v. 26.

+ Gen. c. iii. v. 22.

‡ Gen. c. xi. v. 7.

§ Isaiah, c. vi. v. 8.

only difference of opinion being in accounting for the plurality. To prevent us from taking the words literally, and from imbibing the notion, that the Godhead exists in a plurality of persons ; the modern Jews have instituted two general modes of interpretation ; the first of which is, That it is the regal form of speaking, in which the plural is used for the singular ; the other, That it is the deity conferring with his angels in council. The former opinion has been maintained chiefly by R. Saadias Gaon ; * who alleges in support of it a number of scriptural texts, all which R. Abraham † is pleased to call, *דברי שקר*, false allegations ; and has not only shewn their irrelevancy, but demonstrated, that the opinion itself, has no manner of foundation. Indeed, there is not the smallest authority for it in the compositions of the Old Testament ; which, being penned with that simplicity peculiar to the early ages of the world, introduce all princely characters expressing themselves invariably in their own proper number, and with the strictest grammatical propriety : nor does it distinguish, in that respect, between the most potent of sovereigns and the very lowest of the human species.

But the other opinion, That it is the deity conferring with the angels in council ; has been

* Vid. Aben Ezra on Gen. c. i. v. 26.

† Ibidem.

sanctioned by almost every authority in the Jewish church, and especially by the modern commentators, who to a man expound those passages, as of a monarch deliberating in the cabinet on measures of policy. The grounds, however, upon which this explication is taken up, together with the consequent disparagement to the dignity and excellency of the godhead, in being thus consociated with spirits of an inferior rank, demand the gravest and most serious consideration. That angels should act as coadvisers and coadjutors in the administration of the affairs of the world, is not only repugnant to the very meaning of the term angel, itself; which denotes a being deputed on a mission from God; but is wholly unsanctioned by any declaration to that effect, either in Moses or in the prophets. It is, indeed, difficult to determine, whether the absurdity or the impiety, with which the creator is thus supposed to consult with the created on such highly important matters, deserves the greater execration. True it is, that, in this imaginary council, the deity presides; is decorated with the exalted appendages of majesty; and invested with the most despotic and arbitrary power. But with all the magnificent sway, that either reason can suggest, or the imagination can conceive; I still maintain, that, by being closeted with the angels in council, the deity is

degraded. The sovereigns of the earth, by being enthroned in splendor, and attended with a privy council superior to themselves in mental accomplishments, command honor and respect from the rest of the species : but the sovereign creator of the worlds, by being supposed to confer with the angels, on every weighty and important occasion, is absolutely debased and insulted ; and suffers a higher indignity from this erroneous interpretation of the Jewish church, than man could possibly do, by being supposed to confer with quadrupeds and reptiles, on the design and propriety of human actions. For what has been sometimes alleged in extenuation of that paganish folly, which assigns to Jupiter a council of gods and demigods, That it is all allegory, or poetic fiction ; cannot be alleged in favor of this council of angels, who being allowed by the Jews themselves to have a real existence, permit nothing to be affirmed of them, that is incompatible with their condition. Neither will the apology of Jarchi * avail aught towards deprecating the blasphemy ; That, though they sit in council, they do not furnish to the deity any sort of help: for to say, that they sit in council without being consulted, or that the deity convenes them solely with the view of communicating

* Com. on Gen. c. i. v. 26.

to them his motives of action, is highly ridiculous and absurd, as well as contrary to the very institution of a council, which is usually formed with the expectation of benefit being derived from their accumulated wisdom and conjoint deliberations on the measures propounded. Besides, if this angelic cabinet be really an accession of glory to the supreme being, why did it not always exist? How came it to pass, that for the production of the worlds out of nothing, for the separation of the light from the darkness, for the disposition of the heavenly bodies, and even for the formation of the angels themselves, the individual mind of the deity shall be selfsufficient; but, that, for the creation of man, and for other matters of inferior moment, it should be necessary to hold a council of angels? Surely, if acts the most illustrious for wisdom and power, could proceed solely from himself; it must be the summit of folly, not to say impiety, to bring to his aid a council of inferior and subordinate spirits, in the accomplishment of subsequent and minor achievements. By these and similar arguments, which result from a bare consideration of the question itself, the absurdity of the opinion is amply exposed. The whole body, however, of Jewish professors are not chargeable with this error. The Cabbalists, at least, are a

splendid exception; and especially R. Simeon ben Jochai,* who adverting to the plurality of person in the first of the alleged examples, has thus expounded it. **וְעוֹד נָעֲשָׂה אָדָם לְמַאֲן אָמַר**
הָאֵי אֶלָּא עַתְּ אָמַר לַיְוֵד הָאֵא וְאַז הָאֵא דָאַיְהוּ לְנוּ : “ Moreover, to whom does he say; Let “ us make man? Doubtless, the primary cause is “ addressing Jehovah, who is in the midst of the “ ten Numerations.” Here we have it asserted, on the authority of a most eminent and distinguished Cabbalist, that this conference was not between Jehovah and his angels; but between the first cause and Jehovah, that is, between god and god; or, between one numerical subsistency of the godhead and another, as will hereafter appear, when we proceed to speak of the ten Numerations.

But besides the two general modes of interpretation now mentioned, every endeavour has been used to explain away those texts singly; so as to forestall any argument, which might thence be deduced for the pluripersonality of the godhead. By a few it has been argued, that, in the first text, the word, **נָעֲשָׂה**, is only the participial form of the verb, in Niphal, signifying, made; and, that the plural suffixes do not refer to God, but to the narrator of the speech, that is,

* *Tykune Sohar*, Tyk. 70, fol. 119, col. 1.

to Moses or the human species. But to this R. Abraham * has well replied ; that, admitting it to be the participle only, it ought still to have been preceded by the verb, יָדַי, in order to render the passage, as they would have it ; Let man be made : and, that, with respect to the suffixes, they must needs be referred to God ; as it is said almost immediately after, that God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him, male and female created he them ; so that this criminal attempt to pervert the sense of the original completely fails, Aben Ezra himself being our patron and defender.

In the second text we find some of the highest authorities † expounding the phrase, **באחד ממן**, in the sense of, **באחד בעצמו**, As it were alone by himself ; instead of, Like one of us ; which, if correct, would entirely overturn the grounds of our argument. But in this, as in the former instance, I shall call to our aid the same learned commentator ; ‡ who has plainly shewn that construction to be contrary to the rules of grammar, and, I may add, wholly unexampled either in the scriptures or in the Talmud. **כasher yehi achad** בפתח קטן יהיה בטעם וענינו מוכרת ואם יהיה בפתח נרול יהיה סמוך וכן **באה** שבטי ישראל על כן לא יתכן מדקודק הלשון להיו פורשו כמו אחד ומה

* Com. in loc. † Onkelos, Jarchi, &c. ‡ Aben Ezra in loc.

טעם יהיה לו והיה בעל הטעמי ראיו להדביק
 ממןו עם לדעת ופי ממןו לשון רבים כמו איש ממןו :
 “ As often as the numeral, **אחד**, one, is pointed
 “ with a Segol under the Aleph, it is accompanied
 “ with an accent, and its signification is absolute ;
 “ but when it is pointed with a pathach, it is in
 “ regimen ; and thus we read it in the passage,
 “ As one of the tribes of Israel. It ought not,
 “ therefore, according to the rules of grammar, to
 “ be here expounded, as though it were one
 “ absolute. Besides, what accent has it ? The
 “ author of the accents too should, in that case,
 “ have connected the pronoun, **ממן**, of himself,
 “ with the verbal noun, **לדעת**, as to the know-
 “ ledge, that is, of good and evil. The true
 “ exposition, however, of the pronoun, **ממן**, is,
 “ of us, in the plural number ; just as it occurs
 “ in the expression, A man of us.” Such is the
 language of Aben Ezra, with regard to the pro-
 priety of affixing to the words any other meaning,
 than that which allows the speaker to be in the
 first person plural. To the remaining texts no
 violence has been offered, to pervert the sense of
 them ; if we except the two general modes of
 interpretation already confuted.

Thus rescued from every material objection, our argument remains firm and unshaken ; and, when subjoined to the others preceding it, forms a

ground or basis, on which the pluripersonality of the godhead, and consequently the leading position, which was proposed to be demonstrated, will stand with security. Indeed, if, as has been clearly proved, all spiritual substances, besides the godhead, do really exist in a diversity of persons or subsistences; if every spiritual essence is but an emanation from the deity; if the most proper and sacred appellations of God be common to many individuals; and, if God be known to speak of himself not unfrequently in the first person plural; the belief of a plurality of persons, subsisting in the unity or the sameness of the godhead, must follow of necessity. Nay, Maimonides* frankly concedes, that the contrary opinion of an unity of person has no foundation, but in the tradition of their church; that it can neither be demonstrated on rational principles, nor plausibly vindicated by the ablest metaphysicians, without denying all the attributes of the godhead, even its wisdom, power, and goodness; which however, not only the Jewish church, but the learned theologist himself is obliged to admit, as the foundation of the principal doctrines, which they profess to maintain.

* More Nevoch, Part i. c. 75.

CHAPTER VI.

THUS having, by the formal establishment of a plurality of persons in the godhead, dispatched the leading part of our General Proposition, I press to the consideration of the latter part; which is, That the plurality of persons for which we contend, is a trinity. The first argument in its support I draw from reason itself; which inculcates, that the trinity alone is both a perfect and a necessary number. Previous, however, to my developing the origin of number, it may not be amiss to consider the equivocal import of the term, unity; and to defend the expression of, a trinity in unity, or of, an unity in trinity, from the odious imputation of being a contradiction in terms.

Now unity has two senses; that of identity or sameness of being, when applied to substances; and that of singularity of number, when applied to persons or individual subsistences. In the expression of, a trinity in unity, or, an unity in trinity; it is taken in the former acceptation. For when we assert, that an unity of the godhead exists in a trinity of persons, or, that a trinity of persons subsists in an unity of the godhead; we do not mean an unity of person or

of number, which would indeed be a contradiction in terms : but only an unity, oneness, or sameness of being, which is diametrically opposite to unity of person, and consequently to unity of number: for these, as must appear evident to the least discerning, are equivalent phrases. It is on this, and on no other account, that, in discoursing of the unity of the godhead, I prefer the term, sameness, to, unity; as being wholly unequivocal, and much better calculated, from its familiar use and signification, to guard my meaning from being mistaken and perverted.

But not to retard any longer the prosecution of this argument, I shall briefly lay down the origin of number; from which the weight and force of it will instantly appear. Number, then, is either singular or plural; is the consideration either of an individual unit standing apart by itself, or of many such units taken collectively. But the singular, from which the plural is immediately formed, and into which it may always be resolved; can subsist only so far as the thing itself may be separately counted and distinguished from some other thing, either of its own or of a different species. Things, however, cannot be separated nor regarded individually, without some essential mark of distinction, whereby they must of necessity differ; which, doubtless, with respect to

all bodily substances, is diversity of situation. Diversity of situation, then, is evidently to them the origin of number ; and, though we cannot restrict incorporeal or spiritual substances to situation ; yet, as they do certainly differ individually, as well as corporeal beings, diversity, though not of situation, must still be the ground of their numerical subsistency. But diversity, of whatever kind, necessarily implies three personalities or subsistences ; this, that, and a something besides, which causes the this, to differ from the that, and destroys the solidity or sameness of their being. Conformably to this doctrine, and on principles strictly logical and metaphysical ; R. Shabtai * denies, that any thing less than trinity constitutes number. **האחד בעצמו אינו מספר כי נדר המספר שלשה שבו זוג ונפרד :** “ The unit of itself is not a number ; as the “ definition of number, or that which perfectly “ constitutes number, is a trinity, which consists “ of equal and unequal, that is, of two and one.” Thus is the trinity both a perfect and a necessary number. It is perfect, in that it requires nothing to be understood for the support of its subsistency ; and necessary, in that even unity itself cannot subsist without it.

* Cited by Rit. but without any reference, in his Edition of Sepher Jetsira, p. 73.

That it should be so constantly preferred to every other plural, not founded in circumstances, but left to be determined at discretion; is to be charged solely on its numerical perfection. Thus the prophet Hosea,* being enjoined by God to beget children of an adulterous wife, but without any number being specified; begot Jezreel, Loruchama, and Loammi; but no more: the number being now perfect, and consequently the injunction itself strictly obeyed. So, when Balaam † was invited by Balak to curse the people of Israel; the attempt was made three times, after which it was relinquished as hopeless and vain. Joash,‡ being ordered to strike the earth, struck it thrice, and then desisted; naturally concluding, that, as no particular number had been prescribed, a trinity of times must needs be sufficient. The prophet Elijah,§ when sacrificing to Jehovah in the presence of the priests of Baal; ordered water to be poured on the wood three times, previous to the invocation. The prophet Jeremiah,|| being charged with a solemn denunciation against the land of Israel; calls on it three times, before he utters the prophecy. The same prophet,¶ expostulating with

* C. i. v. 2, &c.

† Num. c. xxiii. et xxiv.

‡ 2 Kings, c. xiii. v. 18.

§ 1 Kings, c. xviii. v. 33, 34.

|| C. xxii. v. 2.

¶ C. vii. v. 4.

his countrymen on the impiety of their conduct, and reproving them for implicitly confiding in their possession of the temple, that he might somewhat mimic their too frequent repetition of the word, temple; reiterates it thrice: thus substituting a certain for an uncertain number. Now, why on the former, and similar occasions, the trinity should be preferred to every other plural, has never yet been explained by the Jewish commentators on general principles; nor, indeed, on any principle, competent to the illustration of the simplest cases. But if we admit, what I think has been amply proved, that it is the first number, which can with strictness of propriety be denominated perfect; not only the foregoing, but a hundred other instances of the like sort, will have a rational solution.

Such is the argument, on which I primarily fix the subsequent position. It contains in itself a sufficient answer to that objection, with which the trinitarian hypothesis has been repeatedly assailed; That, if three persons may subsist in the godhead, why not ten: the reply being prompt and certain; that the former is a perfect and necessary number, whereas the other is not. It is firmly opposed to the advocates for an unity of person, by shewing, that unity of person is but unity of number, which cannot subsist alone, but

requires, that other subsistences co-exist along with it; thus obliging them to profess, either the pluripersonality of the godhead, or polytheism strictly so called. For, unless we insist with the philosopher of Stagira, that matter is coæval with mind, which is polytheism, in the literal acceptation of the term; we seem compelled to relinquish the notion of the deity subsisting in unity of number, and consequently in unity of person.

Nay the Jews themselves, anticipating the force of this argument, and wishing to forestall it; have denied, that the unity for which they contend, is unity of number, or any kind of unity that the mind can comprehend. So says R. Judah Levita: *

יעל הדרך הזה נאמר אחד לשלוול
מננו הרבה לאקיימים לו האחדות המובנת אצלינו
כיו האחד אצלנו מה שנדרבקו חלקייו זה בזה והתדרמו
כאשר תאמר עצם אחד ויד אחד ומים אחדים
ותאמר בזמנ על דרך הדמיון בנוף המתדרבך יום
אחד ושנה אחת: והעצם האלקי מרוומים מהדביקה
“ “ והפרידה ונאמר אחד לשלוול הרבה: “ “
“ manner is he affirmed to be one, to deny of
“ him plurality; and not to affirm of him that
“ unity, which we ourselves comprehend. For
“ with us, that is one, whose parts adhere to
“ each other, and have the same appearance:
“ as, when we say, one bone, one hand, or one

* Sepher Cosri, Mem. ii. p. 78.

“ water; or, when speaking of time, in the similitude of a body compacted together; we say, one day, or one year. But the divine essence is exempt from cohesion and division; and is called one, to the denegation of a plurality.” So R. Moses ben Maimon. *

כמו מון השקר עליו מקרה הרבוי בן הוא מן השקר
 שהו מקרה האחדות רוצח לומר כי אין האחדות
 עליו מקרה האחדות רוצח לומר כי אין האחדות:
 עניין נוסף עצמו אבל הוא אחד לא באחדות:
 “ Like as multitude is erroneously predicated of
 “ him, as an accident; so also is unity erroneously
 “ predicated of him as an accident; that is, unity
 “ in him is not any thing in addition to himself or
 “ his substance; but he is one without any unity.”

הוא אחד לא אחדות † אהדתו ריבוי וחלוקת בו מכל צד:
 הכמה אבל נמנע הרבוי וחלוקת בו מכל צד:
 “ He is one, but that oneness is not of number;
 “ on the contrary, he is exempt from multiplicity
 “ and division in every respect.” So R. Abraham
 ben David: † דעבי האין כי לא יתכן עליו מניין:
 “ לא מניין אחדות ולא מניין ריבוי:
 “ the Supreme Being we can affirm number of
 “ no sort; neither the singular, nor the plural
 “ number.” But to this I would first of all

* Sepher More Nevochim, Part i. c. 57.

† Bechinath Olam, c. xli.

‡ Com. on the second of the thirty-two ways of wisdom:
 prefixed to Sepher Jetsira.

reply, that, if they do not mean unity of number, nor any kind of unity with which the mind is acquainted, they cannot mean unity of person, which is in reality unity of number; and, if not unity of person, then, as they deny the trinity, the godhead, according to them, must be a perfect non-entity; at least, regarding the grounds, on which the generality of modern Jews profess to stand in this matter, I cannot possibly foresee, how the inference is to be avoided. By denying, that the unity which they intend, is unity of person; they deprive themselves of all offensive weapons against the advocates of the trinity, and seem tacitly to confess, that the doctrine of the Christian church makes as near an approximation to divine truth, as any thing which they themselves can oppose, or institute against it: for surely, when driven from every other entrenchment, the trinitarians will always be able to defend themselves, on the same principle that they do; by denying, that the trinity which they predicate of the divine essence, is any thing positive, but only a denegation of that numerical unity, which is admitted on both sides to be incompetent to the godhead.

This singular propensity of the Jewish divines to affirm nothing positively of the deity; but to regard his highest attributes, merely as negations

of certain imperfections ; has led them into several errors, as well in metaphysics as in theology. R. Judah* has even gone so far as to assert, that the predicate, living, when affixed to God, is not to be considered as any thing positive, but only as a negation of death ; because whatever is not living, must be dead : in which assertion there is, certainly, much to be reprehended. First of all, neither, dead, nor, living, is a negative term ; not, living ; because this is positive, and has a negative of its own, inanimate ; nor yet, dead ; for that is privative, and so far from being a negative attribute or quality, is not an attribute of any sort. But should it be urged in reply, that their intention in denying the reality of any of those attributes, goes no farther than to deny, that those properties adhere to the godhead, in the manner conceived and ascribed by man ; I would seriously intreat the Jew to reflect on the tendency of such metaphysical principles ; for if nothing is to be affirmed of God, because nothing can be adequately conceived, they will be compelled to deny that he actually exists ; as the notion which we have of his existence, is as inadequate, and falls as far short of the truth, as that which we entertain of his attributes and perfections.

This view of the subject involves the Jewish

* Mem. ii. p. 77.

adherent, as the reader must perceive, in a certain dilemma. For on the one hand, he is not at liberty to argue, that the divine unity which he maintains, is simply a negation of plurality, without any regard to singularity of number ; that it may signify either something, or nothing, or neither, just as he thinks proper to consider and explain it ; because if, one, has any relation at all to, many, it must be in respect of number ; that being the only way in which, one, and, many, can stand as correlatives. But on the other hand, if he concedes, that this unity is singularity of number ; then will he be obliged to admit the co-existence of other two numerical subsistences along with it, from which it cannot be separated, not even by the utmost effort of the human mind, without self-destruction ; so that, if in the godhead a singularity of number be once avowed, a trinity of persons will of necessity be inferred.

CHAPTER VII.

BUT the truth of the position derives no small support from the many symbolical actions and expressions in sacred history ; in which nothing, except a trinity of persons subsisting in the godhead, can possibly be insinuated. They

differ, materially, from the examples adduced in favor of the trinity being a perfect number; as in those the only matter of astonishment was the predilection of the trinity; but, in the instances now to be alleged, either the power, the glory, or the habitation, of the deity is visibly manifested: so that the various circumstances, with which each action or speech is accompanied; must necessarily be referred to him, as their principal subject.

The restoration of the dead child to life, by the prophet, Elijah; which was effected solely by the power and miraculous interposition of God; was evidently an action of this complexion. * וַיַּהַי מִדְבָּר עַל הַיּוֹדֵעַ שְׁלֹשׁ פָּעָמִים וַיַּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים יְהוָה וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים תָּשִׁב נֶא נֶפֶשׁ הַיּוֹדֵעַ עַל קְרָבָו וַיִּשְׁמַע יְהוָה בְּקוֹל אֱלֹהִים וַיָּשִׁב נֶפֶשׁ הַיּוֹדֵעַ עַל קְרָבָו: “ And he stretched himself over the child three times: and invoked Jehovah, and said: “ O Jehovah, my God; let the life of this child, “ I pray, return into the midst of him again. And “ Jehovah attended to the intreaty of Elijah: and “ the life of the child returned into the midst of “ him again, and he lived.” Now, if we may not be permitted to view the trinity of number, so eminently displayed in this transaction, as a symbol of three persons in the godhead; I can

* 1 Kings, c. xvii. v. 21.

suggest no manner of reason, why it should have been used on so solemn an occasion; and, certainly, the Jews themselves afford none that is worthy of attention. Kimchi* has alleged, that as Jehovah was pleased to grant the prayer of the prophet, on his having extended himself three times; it was not necessary to do it any oftener: but this is leaving the question, just as he found it; for seeing that the reanimation of the child did not at all depend on the gestures of the prophet, but only on the will of God, the difficulty still recoils upon us; why the deity, who does nothing without sufficient motives, should have deferred the gracious act till the number, three, was accomplished; if something mystical had not been intended, by this numerical symbol.

The transition of the glory of Jehovah, as beheld by the same prophet; was another action of this sort. וְהִנֵּה יְהוָה עֹבֵר וְרוּחַ נְדֹולָה † וְחַזֵּק מִפְרָק הַרִּים וְמִשְׁבָּר סְלָעִים לְפָנֵי יְהוָה לֹא בְּרוּחַ יְהוָה וְאַחֲרַ הָרוּחַ רָעֵשׂ לֹא בְּרָעֵשׂ יְהוָה: וְאַחֲרַ הָרָעֵשׂ אַשׁ לֹא בְּאַשׁ יְהוָה וְאַחֲרַ הָאַשׁ קֹול: “And behold Jehovah passed by; “and there was a great and strong wind, which “shattered the mountains, and rent the rocks “before Jehovah; but Jehovah was not in the

* Com. in loc. † 1 Kings, c. xix, v. 11, 12.

“ wind : and after the wind, there was a rumbling
“ noise ; but Jehovah was not in the rumbling
“ noise : and after the rumbling noise, there was
“ a fire ; but Jehovah was not in the fire : and
“ after the fire, there was a low, shrill voice.”

R. Isaac Abarbinel, who in commenting on this text, has exercised the utmost ingenuity ; asserts that the three terrors, preceding the articulation of the deity, corresponded to the three miracles, which had been previously wrought by the prophet, without any order from God : namely, the prevention of rain for a term of years, the restoration of the dead child, and the bringing down of fire from heaven to consume the victim : that the glory of the Lord was revealed thus terribly to reprehend his past presumption ; and, that the tenuity of the voice was designed to signify to the prophet the great detriment, which the glory of Jehovah had actually sustained, by the achievement of those miracles without the divine authority. But, surely, this is indulging in conjecture to a criminal pitch. For though it is not expressly said, that Jehovah was consulted on each of those occasions ; yet it by no means will follow, that the prophet did not consult him, or that he was not directed by the holy spirit in the framing of his petitions. Never could any miracles have appeared so opportunely for the reclaiming of the

Jewish nation, as the visitation of their country with drought, under the reign of a most wicked and idolatrous prince ; as the calling down of fire from heaven, in the midst of so many religious apostates, and idolatrous priests ; and as the restitution of an only child to the arms of his mother, which, whilst it did prejudice to no one, served as a just reward for her piety and hospitality ; and furnished, in the midst of so many advocates for infidelity and apostacy, a well timed testimony of the divinity of Jehovah. The learned commentator, indeed, is constrained to own, that the prophet performed those miracles with a pious intention ; and, that this was the reason, why they were permitted to be wrought : still maintaining, however, that he acted presumptuously ; which, in a writer of such uncommon discernment, is something extraordinary. How should that prophet, I would ask, who was so highly favoured with the directions and admonitions of the holy spirit, and against whom not a word of accusation was ever uttered, not even in this angry visit, as esteemed by our author ; be charged with presumption ? The declaration, that Jehovah was not in any of the three terrors ; is no corroboration, as he has imagined, of the truth of his exposition. That Jehovah was as much in the terrors, as in the still small voice ; is apparent

from the manifestation being called a transition ; which would have been wholly improper, if the divinity had not been as personally present in the terrors themselves, as in the voice that followed them. It was the necessity of receiving all spiritual communication in this peculiar manner, which makes the prophet deny, that Jehovah was in any of the forms, preceding the allocution ; it being incompetent for man to know, except by such signs and demonstrations, whether a spirit be really present or not : for though it may well seem a great indignity to God, to be literally present in any of the elements of nature ; it can be no less so, to be present in the articulation of speech ; which is but a corporeal effect, or accident ; and has no existence, independently of matter. Seeing, then, that this interpretation of Abarbinel, though highly ingenious, and the only thing worthy of being noticed in opposition to our argument ; cannot be maintained on plausible grounds ; I claim this transition of Jehovah as a symbolical action of the three persons in the godhead ; and the tenuous articulation as significant of that illustrious event, the incarnation of the word of God.

The appearance of Jehovah to the patriarch Abraham, in the forest of Mamre ; is to be regarded as a most certain and undoubted inti-

* וַיַּרְא אֶלְיוֹן יְהוָה בְּאַלְמָנָה מִמְּרָא וְהַיְשָׁב פָּתָח הַאֲהָל כְּחַם הַיּוֹם: וַיַּשְׁאַל עַנְיָנוּ וַיַּרְא וְהִנֵּה שֶׁלְשָׁה אֲנָשִׁים נִצְבִּים עַל־יְרֵץ לְקַרְאָתֶם מִפְּתָח הַאֲהָל וַיִּשְׁתַּחַוו אֶרְצָה: וַיֹּאמֶר אֲדֹנִי אָם נָא מִצְאָתִי חַן בְּעַנִּיךְ אֶל נָא תַּעֲבֶר: “*And Jehovah appeared to him in “the forest of Mamre; and he was sitting at the door of the tent, it being the hottest part of the day. And he lifted up his eyes, and looked; and behold, there were three persons, standing towards him: and, as soon as he saw it, he hastened from the door of the tent to meet them, and bowed himself to the ground, and said: “My Lord, if now I may find grace in thine eyes, do not, I pray, pass by, without calling upon thy servant.”*” That the three personages, who thus appeared to Abraham, sustained only the character of angels, is evident, as well from the consideration of the story, as from the circumstance of two of the angels having come down to Sodom, in the evening; which fully implies, that the other one, from whom they had parted company, was also an angel; and had been left behind, in conversation with the patriarch. But whilst I agree with the generality of the Jewish divines, in supposing the visitors to be all angels; I wholly differ from them, in the reason

* Gen. c. xvii. v. 1—3.

to be assigned for this manifestation of Jehovah, in a trinity of persons. To account for their plurality, they lay down the position, That no individual angel is ever charged with a multiplicity of legations at once; which, though not to be contradicted, will be insufficient to account for the number, on the present occasion. For not to mention, that R. Solomon* assigns to the first of them the annunciation of the birth of Isaac, to the second the curation of Abraham, and to the third the destruction of Sodom; whereas the Jerusalem Targumist† assigns to the first the annunciation of the birth of Isaac, to the second the deliverance of Lot, and to the third the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah; not to mention, I say, the discrepancy of expositors in allotting to each of the angels his own proper mission; how happened it, that they all met together at the door of the tent; that they all dined with the patriarch, and all inquired for Sarah; that they all set off together for Sodom, in company with Abraham; that both of the angels, who arrived in the city that evening, tarried with Lot, put forth their hands, and rescued him from the fury of the Sodomites; that both declared themselves sent to destroy the town; that both took hold of Lot and his family, and

* Com. in loc.

† Ibidem.

placed them beyond the reach of danger ; finally, how happened it, that the angel with whom the patriarch conversed alone, should manifest his intention of going to ascertain in person, whether the impiety of the Sodomites were altogether as gross, as had been previously represented ; if each of these angels was invested with a separate mission ? To this the commentator, who contents himself with applying the forementioned position to the case ; can furnish no answer : nor is it in the power of man to invent a solution of the text, less liable to exception, than that which is here proposed, in defence of the present argument. R. Abraham ben Ezra,* indeed, though he does not assent to the notion itself ; yet candidly confesses, that some, alluding no doubt to the Cabballists, inferred, from this very passage, a trinity of divine persons subsisting in the godhead. **הנה קצת אמרו כי הושם ניאנשין הוא אחד והוא ניילאיית פרדו :** “ Behold some say, that Jehovah is three persons ; that he is both one and three, and these undivided.”

The invocation of the Seraphic host, is another scriptural intimation of this complexion. **וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה קָדוֹשׁ קָדוֹשׁ קָדוֹשׁ יְהוָה צְבָאֹת :** “ **זה אל זה אמר קדוש קדוש קדוש יהוה צבאות :** “ **מלא כל הארץ כבודו :** “ And this called to that, “ and said ; Holy, Holy, Holy, is Jehovah of

* Com. in loc.

+ Isaiah, c. vi. v. 3.

“hosts: all the earth is full of his glory.” The manifest embarrassment under which Jonathan,* R. Solomon Jarchi,† R. Judah Levita,‡ and R. David Kimchi,§ labour, in severally attempting to explain this triplication of holiness; fully convinces me, that it is to be regarded in no other light, than as a development of the sacred triunity. It is absurd to contend with any of those authors, either that it is an allusion to the three worlds; or that it is the mutual cheer, and joint acclamation of all the Seraphs; or that it is an hyperbolical way of predicating holiness of God: as none of these elucidatory principles will account for the number being employed on other occasions; nor, indeed, on this, if the propriety of their application be strictly investigated. The belief of three worlds, though generally received in the Jewish church; is not so plainly revealed in the sacred writings, as to be taken, in all cases, for a certain and infallible truth. But even admitting it as an axiom, the pertinence and utility of manifesting to the prophet a trinity of worlds, by thrice predicating, holy, of God; remain to be explained. That it originated from the mutual emulation, and provocation of the Seraphic host, to extol the majesty and sanctity of Jehovah; is a supposition,

* Isaiah, c. vi. v. 3.

† Com. in loc.

‡ Sepher Cosri, Mem. iv. p. 263.

§ Com. in loc.

which, however highly to be applauded in other respects, does not account for the bare triplication of the predicate, holy; whether we contend with R. Solomon for the conjoint acclamation of all the Seraphs, or with R. David for the mutual cohortation of each of them singly. Nor will the difficulty vanish on adopting the exposition of R. Judah, that the superior sanctity of Jehovah can be denoted, and expressed, only by an excess of repetition: for in that case, the Seraphs would have said, holy, oftener than thrice; and the prophet must have prevaricated in recording a definite for an indefinite number of times. The plain, however, and literal acceptation of the text must needs be; that each of the Seraphim, whatever might be the exact number of their chorus, or of their several and distinct repetitions, rehearsed in full what is thus recorded of them, Holy, Holy, Holy, without any pausation or interruption of the speech. So says R. Abraham ben Ezra.* קדושׁ שלשׁ פעמים שנִי אמרו תמידׁ: “Holy, three times; for thus they say constantly.” To this may be added, that in the ninety-ninth Psalm, the sacred poet coincides with the Seraphs in predicating, holy, of God, a trinity of times; and I call upon any man to shew the futility of that reasoning, which makes the triplication, in both

* Com. in loc.

places, significant of the persons in the godhead, rather than of any other thing, that can possibly be suggested.

The last, though by no means the weakest proof, that I shall bring forward of this sort; is the sacerdotal benediction. *
 יְבָרֶכְךָ יְהוָה וַיִּשְׁמַרְךָ : יְאָרֵךְ יְהוָה פָּנָיו אֲלֵיךָ : וַיָּשֵׁם יְהוָה פָּנָיו אֲלֵיךָ : “ Jehovah bless thee, and keep thee. Jehovah make his face shine on thee, and grant thee grace. Jehovah lift up his countenance upon thee, and afford thee peace.” In this divinely prescribed form of blessing, what cannot but fix the attention, and stir up the curiosity of every reader; is the triplication of the name, Jehovah, the most sacred appellation of God; without any apparent necessity of construction, or beauty of emphasis. The circumstance, indeed, is so singularly striking, that it must have been observed by the Jewish critic; but whether from inability to state the true reason, or from a desire to refrain from saying any thing, which might seem to militate against the vulgar opinion; all the commentators, that I have had an opportunity of consulting, are silent on the subject. R. Isaac Abarbinel,* it is true, has taken notice of the circumstance, and has premised his remarks on the whole of the benediction, in such

* Com. in loc.

a manner, as to afford some hope that we should have it explained ; but in this we are miserably disappointed : for, instead of relieving us from every doubt and uncertainty on the question, he has actually omitted its elucidation altogether ; which, in a writer of such stupendous learning and ingenuity, is matter of astonishment accompanied with suspicion. For, if there had been nothing extraordinary in it, to collect a few similar phraseologies, and to manifest to the reader the folly of his admiration ; could never have been difficult for the pen of Abarbinel. But, if it be really a singular circumstance in the form of the benediction, and has no parallel but what is equally involved in mystery and obscurity ; let the embarrassment of the literal expositor be candidly acknowledged, and some higher mode of interpretation called in ; which may at once afford a rational solution of the text, and inculcate a doctrine not unworthy of inspiration. The Cabballist, I am persuaded, will perceive the necessity of expounding this, as well as the other symbolical passages of the inspired penmen, here alleged ; with a reference to the superior Numerations of the godhead, which are thus most eminently and wonderfully displayed. The whole of the examples, indeed, to say the least we can of them, are fair intimations of a trinity of persons subsisting

in the divine nature ; and, if we do but consider the urgent necessity there was, in the first ages of the world, to prevent mankind from dilapsing into a state of idolatry, and gross polytheism ; are as explicit declarations, perhaps, of the trinitarian hypothesis, as could well have been given.

CHAPTER VIII.

IN proceeding to the discussion of an argument, which is expressly deduced from what is called the mystery of the Metatron, it may not be improper to premise, that by the term, mystery, I do not mean any thing elevated above the grasp of human intellect, or that cannot be rendered comprehensible to the bulk of mankind ; but a divine and important doctrine, which, from the abstruseness and religious scrupulosity with which it has hitherto been handed down in the Jewish church, is in a manner concealed from vulgar minds, and which, like many other theological notions, requires to be metaphysically weighed before its nature and value can be duly appreciated. The doctrine is simply this ; That, in the writings of Moses and the prophets, there occurs frequent mention of a divine legate ; whom the Jewish divines, from the godlike manner in

which he is every where designated in the sacred oracles, have been led to call, the Metatron, the great angel, the guardian or redeemer of Israel, the Almighty, nay, Jehovah also ; as will eventually appear from the testimonies to be produced. That this Metatron is a divine subsistency, and in essence and quality wholly corresponds with what we Christians understand by the second personality of the godhead, is the sum of the present argument ; and, therefore, without urging any further preliminary remark, I proceed to lay before the reader that evidence and authority, on which it is recommended to his favour and acceptance.

The earliest mention of the angel, Metatron, by name, is in the Gemara ; where R. Idith, by a reference to this personage, is applauded for the ingenuity with which he made answer to the follower of Sadok.* אמר ר' נחמן חי מיון דיבר לאחדורי לצדקוי ברב אידית ליהדר ואיל לא משה אמר עליה אל חי עלה אליו מיבעי ליה אל ויה מטרון ששמו כשם רבו דכתיב כישמי בקרבו אי הני נפלחו ליה כתיב אל תמר בו אל תמיירני בו אם כן לא ישא לפשעכם למה לי אל הימנוחא דידן דאפיילו בפרונקא נמי לא קבילנוה דכתיב ויאמר אליו : R. Nachman said ;

* Sanhedrin, perek 4.

“ whosoever has the knowledge to answer a Saducean, in the manner of R. Idith; let him answer him; if not, let him hold his tongue. The Saducean said to R. Idith: It is written; “ And he said unto Moses, Come up unto Jehovah. The expression should have been come up unto me. He replied: This is the Metatron, whose name is as the name of his master; according to the scripture: For my name is in him. If so, let us worship him. But it is written: Make no change in him: change not me in him. If so, what am I to understand by the words; He will not forgive your transgression? The other replied: Such is our faith; as we did not even receive him, in the quality of a substitute; according to what is written: “ And he said, except thy presence go with us, &c.” In this important passage, there is such dignified mention made of the angel, Metatron; that I am surprised it has not been adequately noticed by those, whose pens have been employed in commenting on the Talmud. Fortunately, the defect of which I complain, is opportunely supplied by R. Moses Gerundensis.*

אבל בתלמוד שאלו עליה אליו מיבעי ליה ובכאנן אמרו זה מטטרון ששמו כשם רבו קלומר ואל משה אמר השם הנזכר בתחילת העניין ויאמר ה אל משה

* Com. Ex. c. xxiv. v. 1.

על אל מטטרון שנקרא בשם ה' ורטעם על אל מקום הכבוד אשר שם המלאך הנדול והכונה כי משה יבא בתוך הענן אשר שם כבוד ה' ולא יבא אל השם המויחד כי לא וראני האדם וחיה ואין כוונת רבותינו כלל במא שכתב ר'שי למעלה נם במסכת סנהדרין הפק הרבה הענן וכבר הזכרתי כוונתם בשם הזה וכל דבריהם אמרת אלא שדברו בהגד' היה אל כמסתיר פנים כי רב אידי לא נלה למן הוא השואל עניין מטטרון הנדול וסודו וחילתה אבל הזכיר לו כי על המלאך מורה דרך בעולם התחתון הכתבי הזה מדבר ולפיכך אמרו לו לא פאלו בפראנקה לא קבילנית דכתיב אם אין פניך הולכים שאנו לא קבלנו שליח בלחוי השם הנכבד וכבר פירשתי סוד הפנים וכל העניין בבואך במסכילים בו במתן התורה : But “ “ in the Talmud it is asked, why the words are “ “ not, Come up unto me ; and it is there replied, “ “ that this is the Metatron ; whose name is as the “ “ name of his master, that is ; the Jehovah, “ “ mentioned in the beginning of the narrative, “ “ said unto Moses ; Come up unto the Metatron, “ “ who, like the name of myself, is called Jehovah : “ “ the meaning of which is ; Do thou ascend “ “ unto the glorious place, where is the great “ “ angel ; the intention being, that Moses should “ “ come unto the midst of the cloud, where was “ “ the glory of Jehovah ; but not that he should “ “ come unto Jehovah, personally so called ; For “ “ no man shall see me, and live. Nor was the

“ meaning of our Fathers at all agreeing with
“ what R. Solomon Jarchi has written above.
“ In *Massecheth Sanhedrin*, too, the learned
“ Rabbi has perverted the matter. Their mean-
“ ing, with respect to the name, I have already
“ considered; nor is there any thing in all that
“ they have said, which is not true: but what
“ they affirm in this part of the Talmud, is inve-
“ loped in obscurity; for R. Idith did not reveal
“ to the heretic, that interrogated him, the nature
“ and mystery of the great Metatron; by no
“ means. But he told him, that this scripture is
“ spoken of the angel, the director of the way,
“ in this inferior world; and, therefore, his words
“ to him are: For we did not receive him even
“ in the quality of a substitute; as it is written:
“ Except thy presence go; for we did not receive
“ the legate without the glorious name. The
“ mystery of the presence, together with the
“ whole matter, I have already expounded clearly
“ and plainly to those, who have any under-
“ standing of the subject, in the giving of the
“ law.” That the learned commentator has here
given the genuine sense of the Talmud, is most
unquestionably true; and if no other authority
could have been produced, it would have been an
invaluable testimony in support of the present
argument.

In mysticising the Mosaic precept of not taking the mother, whilst sitting on her nest, either with eggs or young ; the author of *Tykune Sohar* develops much of the cabbalistic doctrine. Under each of the terms contained in the text, that is to say, bird, nest, eggs, young, and so forth, he supposes something divine to be understood ; adducing at the same time confirmation as well from the Talmudic traditions, as from scriptural passages of a similar complexion. In unfolding the cabbalistic sense of that bird, he introduces from the Talmud a story of Rabba bar bar Channa ; who, whilst he was sailing in a vessel, saw the very bird itself up to the legs in the sea ; and accommodating that allegory to the case in hand, determines the bird, as will appear from the subjoined extract, to have been the Metatron.*

וכריסיא דלהת' ים המלח כסא דין שוף דאייהו צפר דיליהו איהו מטטרון עליה אתרמר כי שוף השמים يولיך את הקול קול דק"ש כלול שית וומין דחול ושליט עליוו ונטיל ההוא קול ופרח ביה עד עמודא דאמצעיתא דאייהו קול י"ז על הימים ולית מים אלא תורה : But the lower throne is the salt sea, the throne of judgment. The fowl, that is, its bird, is the Metatron ; of which it is said in scripture : For a bird of heaven shall convey the voice ; the voice of the lesson, Hear, O Israel,

* *Tykune Sohar*, p. 2, col. 2.

“ during the whole of the six holidays. It rules over them, and takes up the voice, and flies with it unto the Central Column ; which is the voice of Jehovah upon the waters, and the waters are nothing but the law.” In this testimony, there is evidently ascribed to the Metatron a divine nature ; as well as the angelic function of transporting to heaven, on the most solemn festivals, the rehearsal of the Shema. The like title is expressly given to it by the same Cabbalist, in another part of this work.*

אדם כי ימות באهل דא אָדָם בְּלִיעֵל וּמִסְטְּרָא דָא בָּר נְשָׁה קָרְיוּ מַתְּ
 מעָקָרָא מִקְמֵי דָא חֲבָרָיו עַלְמָא אַבְלָלָא אַתְּמָר עַל אָדָם
 דָא יְהוָה מִסְטְּרָא דָקְדָשָׁא דָאוּת אָדָם דָא יְהוָה מַלְאָךְ
 וְדָא מִשְׁתְּרָוָן וְאַתְּ אָדָם בְּדִיוֹקָנָא דְקִבְּה דָא יְהוָה
 אַצְּלָוְתְּיָה וְדָא יְהָדָה וְאַתְּ קָא וְלִיתָה לְיהָ בְּרִיאָה וְיִצְּרָה
 וְעַשְ׈יהָ אֶלָּא אַצְּלָוְתָה וּבְאַתְּרָה דָא לְתָה חַטָּא וְלֹא
 מֹתָה חַדָּה לֹא יְגַדֵּךְ רָע וְעַל הָאֵי אָדָם בְּלִיעֵל מַנִּי
 קְבָּחָה דָלָא לְמִיכְלָמָן אַיְלָנָא דְטוּבָה וְרָע וְדָלָא לְעַרְבָּא
 לְיהָ עַם טָב דָהָא יְהוָה דָעֵרִיב כְּסֶפֶא עַם עַופְרָתָה :

“ Man, when he shall die in the tent. This is the man of Belial ; and from the side of this man was the predicate, dead, originally denominated even before the world was created ; but it is not affirmed of the man, who is from the side of holiness. For there is a man, that is an angel ; and this is the Metatron. And there is a man in

* *Tykune Sohar*, *Tyk.* 67, p. 101.

“ the Image of God, who is an emanation from
 “ him ; and this is Jehovah, of whom can be
 “ affirmed neither creation, nor formation, nor
 “ fabrication, but only emanation ; and, in this
 “ place, there is neither sin, nor death ; and
 “ hither also, is to be referred the scripture,
 “ Neither shall evil dwell with thee. But the
 “ man of Belial God commanded not to eat of
 “ the tree of good and evil, nor to associate
 “ himself with good ; for that would be to act the
 “ part of him, who mixes sterling with dirt.”

Let it not be supposed, however, that because he calls the Metatron, an angel; he really regards him as such, in the ordinary acceptation of that term. So far from this, he declares him to be above all angels, whatever ; and every thing besides, which ranks in the creation.*

בראשית אלקים דא מטטרון דברא ליה קב"ה קדמון
 וראשית לכל צבא השמים וلتתא ודא איהו אדם
 הקטן דקב"ה עבד ליה בדיקנא וצירא דליעלא
 בלא ערבותיא : In the beginning created he
 “ Elohim. This is the Metatron, whom God
 “ created the first, and the origin, of all the host
 “ of heaven and earth ; and this is that man, the
 “ less, whom God made in an image and figure ;
 “ that was celestial, without the mixture of evil.”

בראשית ברא אלקים מאו אלקים להט †

* Tykune Sohar, Tyk. 67, p. 101.

† Tyk. 68, p. 102.

החרב המתהפהת לשמר את דרכ עץ החיים מטה
 האלקים ודאי ודא מטטרון והוא אוקימנא ליה
 ראתהפהך מדינה לרחמי וביה אשתנוו כל דיווינן
 דלא דמו דא לדא כד אטהפהך מימנא לsuma לא
 אחזי פרצופה דשור וכד אטהפהך משמא לא לימינא
 אחזי פרצופה דאריה וכד אטהפהך מתרויהו למערב
 אחזר אנטפו ואותהפהך לנשר וכד אטהפהך מתרויהו
 למורה דאייהו באמצועיתא אטהפהך לאדם לית דיווינא
 בעלה דלא אישתמודע ביה י"ב מזולות אטהזין ביה
 וכל דיווינן דמלאכיא ודיווינן דנסמתין ודיווינן
 רבל מה דאתברוי בשמייא ובארעה הוא כליל בשמייא
 וארעא ושם שא וסירה וככבייא ומזוליא וכרכסיא
 ומלאכיהם וג"ע וניהנמ : "In the beginning : " created he Elohim. What is Elohim ? The
 " flame of the sword, which turneth itself to
 " guard the way of the tree of life ; the rod of
 " God, no doubt. But this is the Metatron ; and
 " behold, we maintain concerning him, that he
 " turns himself from judgment to mercy ; and in
 " him are varied all the images, which are different
 " from each other. When he turns himself from
 " the right hand to the left he has the face of
 " an ox ; but when he turns himself from the
 " left hand to the right, he has the face of a
 " lion. When he turns himself from both of them,
 " towards the West, he converts his face, and
 " changes himself to an eagle ; but when he
 " turns himself from both of them, towards the

“ East, which is in the middle, he changes himself to a man. There is no image in the world, which is not expressed in him. In him are seen the twelve signs, and all the images of the angels, and the images of souls, and the images of all things, that have been created, in heaven and in earth. He is every thing in the heavens, the earth, the sun, the moon, the stars, the signs, the thrones, the angels, the garden of Eden, and Hell.” There are, indeed, in this book of *Tykune Sohar*, more indications of the Metatron than in any one work besides ; but from its being constantly spoken of as a subsistency already known, it is no easy matter to detach from the context any particular mention of it, without adducing at the same time some other mysteries ; which to those, who are unacquainted with the language of the Cabbalists, must appear highly obscure. I shall cite and illustrate, however, one or two more examples ; and first, where the clearest evidence shines forth of its being an emanation immediately from the godhead.*

דְּהַבְּרִי אָקְמָן קְדָמָן כָּל הַנְּשָׁמָרִי נְזָרוֹי

מִכְסָא הַכְּבָד וְתִמְןָן שְׁרִירָא שְׁכִינָתָא עַלְאָה וְלִיתָּה
ה' בְּלֹא יַוְבִּנְן דָּא כִּי יַד עַל כָּס וְיַה שְׁרִירָא בְּמַטְתָּרוֹן
וְדָא אִיהוּ רֹוח הַשְּׁכָלִי דָא הָא אַצְילָוּ ה' וְשְׁרִירָא בְּאָפָן
וְדָא נְפָשָׁה הַשְּׁכָלִת בָּאָרֶח אַצְילָתָא דָאִית נְשָׁמָה

* *Tyk.* 69, p. 107.

וּרְוח וּנְפָשָׁ שְׁכִילָה וְלֹא בָּאֲרָח אֲצִילָה אֶלְאָ אַתָּמָר
 בְּהָוּן נְזָרוֹת וְאַיְנוֹן כְּסָא וּמְלָאֵךְ וְאָפָּן זְכָאֵן אַיְנוֹן
 יִשְׂרָאֵל דְּסָלְקָנוּ הַבְּלִי דְּצָלּוֹתִין בְּהָוּן לְנָבִי אַתָּהוּן
 דְּקָבְּיהָ וִשְׁכִינָתָא עַלְאָה וְתַחְתָּה : " For so have :
 " our Fathers laid it down, that all the souls are
 " cut out from under the Throne of Glory ; and
 " there resides the upper Habitation. But there
 " is no *He* without *Jod*, that is to say, the Habi-
 " tation, which is denoted by the letter, *He*, is
 " inseparable from the whole of the godhead, de-
 " noted by the *Jod* ; and, therefore, since the
 " hand is on the throne of *Jah*, it resides, that is,
 " the Habitation, resides, in the Metatron ; which
 " is an intelligent spirit, and an emanation of
 " *Jehovah*. It resides too in the wheel which is
 " an intelligent soul by way of emanation. For
 " there are mind, spirit, and soul intelligent, not
 " by way of emanation ; but cut out, as is affirmed
 " of them. Now these three, the throne, the
 " angel, and the wheel, that is to say, the Throne
 " of Glory, the Metatron, and the lower Habi-
 " tation, are the justifiers of Israel ; for by their
 " means the incense of prayers ascends to the
 " letters of the Holy One, blessed be he, together
 " with the upper, and lower Habitation." In
 another place, in order to demonstrate the excel-
 lency, of the cabbalistic doctrine above that of
 the Mishna, he compares the former to the upper

Habitation, that is, to the deity itself; but the latter to the Metatron: and from that he is led on to draw other comparisons, all, as it should seem, to the disparagement of the Metatron; which, finally, he makes to stand in the same relation to the upper Habitation, that a maid does to her mistress. The emanatory world being always the subject matter of the Cabbala, he proceeds to observe, that men do not investigate the operations of it in unity, except with the letters, *Jod, He, Vau*; that is to say, men do not predicate of one individual being the various operations of the spiritual world, unless that be associated with the letters of the name, Jehovah; which having been pronounced by Moses to be one in essence, but not in subsistency, may have any act, whatever, that takes place in the intellectual world, affirmed of it, though it should be achieved by angels; for Jehovah includes always both God and his angels. Thus much being premised, the following testimony, in reference to the Metatron, will be somewhat intelligible: *

דודאי באין תלת דורשין: *
 במרכבה ביחיד ובלא אלין תלת לאו איהו יהודא
 דיליה ודא איהו רוא דאייה קב"ה לעילא חד
 בשכינתייה וכד איהו לחתא במתטרון بلا שכינתייה
 אשתני ביה ובנין דא אמר אלישע אחר שמא ח"ז
 ashi רשות יש ובנין דא אמר אל תמיוני בו כישמי

* Tyk. 28, p. 74.

בקרבו בנין דמטרון איהו שני למלך וכד איהו
 שכינהה بلا בעלה אתקרי האי מלאך משנה לה
 ואשתニアת דלא אשתחמודען בה חילין ומה דאויה
 מטרוניתא : Certainly, with these three letters
 " they investigate the intellectual world in unity
 " of number; but without these three it has no
 " unity: and this is that mystery, that the Holy
 " One, blessed be he, when above, is one with
 " his Habitation; but when below with the Me-
 tatron, without his Habitation, he is changed in
 " him. For this reason, says Elisha, there is
 " even another name; how much more probable
 " is it, that there are two different authorities?
 " Hence saith the scripture, change not me in
 " him; for my name is in him: because the
 " Metatron is second to the King; and, when
 " the Habitation is without her husband, this
 " angel is called her Mishna, and she is changed;
 " for the powers are not recognized in her, nor
 " what belongs to her as a consort." From these
 passages out of *Tykune Sohar* it is fully apparent
 that the Cabbalists regarded the Metatron as an
 emanation from the godhead; and that in considera-
 tion of his personally supplying the place of
 the Supreme Being, in the direction of sublunary
 affairs, they esteem and mention him, as an
 angelic subsistency.

But the remarks which R. Moses Gerundensis

has made, in reference to this illustrious personage, are particularly deserving of our notice and attention. The Jehovah, or angel Jehovah, that appeared to Moses in the bush, he evidently explains of the Metatron; and though the language of the author in this place is uniformly the same with what he holds forth on every subsequent occasion, I shall not hesitate to accumulate testimony upon testimony, in order that the reader may be satisfied, what was the real and fixed opinion of R. Moses Gerundensis on the doctrine of the Metatron.*

וירא מלאך ה' אליו בלבת אש אם' הכתוב מתחלה
 וירא מלאך ה' ואחר כן אמר וירא ה' כי סר לראות
 ויקרא אליו אלילים ולכן אמר ר' אברהם כי אלהים
 בכאן הוא המלאך הנזכר כמו כי ראוי אליהם
 פנים אל פנים וטעם אני אלחי אביך ידבר
 השליח בלשון שולחו ואינו נכוון כי משה נדול
 הנבואה לא יסתיר את פניו מן המלאך ורבותי
 אמרו בבראשי' רבה מלאך זה מיכאל רבי יוסי
 הארץ בכל מקום שהוא רואים אותו היו אומרי' שם
 רבעינו הקדוש כך כל מקום שמייכאל נראה שם הוא
 כבוד השכינה נתכוונו לומ' שמהלה נראה אליו
 מיכאל ושם כבוד השכינה והוא לא ראה הכבוד כי
 לא הכנין דעתו לנבואה וכאשר כיוון לבוoser לראות
 נתגלה אליו מראה השכינה ויקרא אליו אלהים
 מתוך הסנה ועל דרך האמת המלאך הזה הוא
 המלאך הנואל שנאמר כישמי בקרבו הוא שאם"

* Com. Ex. iii. 2.

ליעקב א נ כי האל בית אל ובו נ אמר ווקרא אליו אלהים
 אבל י קרא ב מדת ה היה מלאך בהנחת העול ו כנ
 כתיב וו ציאנו ה' מצרי ו כתוב ו שלח מלאך
 וו ציאנו מצרי ונאמ' ו מלאך פניו הו שיעם כלומר
 מלאך שהו פניו כד כתיב פני ילכו וה ניחותי לך
 והוא שנאמר בו ופתאום י בא אל היכלו האדון אשר
 אתם מבקשי ו מלאך הברית אשר אתם חפצי הנה
 בא : And the angel of the Lord appeared to
 " him, in a flame of fire. The scripture says at
 " the first, And the angel of the Lord appeared :
 " but afterwards it says, And the Lord saw that
 " he turned aside to look, and God called to him.
 " Hence R. Abraham asserts, that the God here
 " is the angel before mentioned : being used, as
 " in the text, For I have seen God face to face :
 " and, that the sense of the passage, I am the
 " God of thy father, is to be explained on the
 " principle, that the person, charged with the
 " legation, expresses himself in the character of
 " the person that has sent him. But this expo-
 " sition is by no means probable ; as Moses,
 " being so mighty a prophet, would never have
 " concealed his face at the sight of an angel. In
 " Bereshith Rabba, our Fathers affirm this angel
 " to be Michael. Rabbi Jose, the Long, say
 " they, wherever they might happen to see, they
 " called out, There is Rabbenu Hakkadosh ; so
 " wherever Michael was seen, there also was the

“ glory of the Habitation. Their meaning is,
“ that at the first Michael appeared to him, and
“ there too, was the glory of the Habitation ;
“ but he did not perceive the glory, because he
“ had not formed his mind to prophecy; but
“ when he had disposed his heart, and turned
“ aside to look, then was revealed to him a sight
“ of the Habitation, and God called to him from
“ the midst of the bush. Nothing, indeed, can
“ be more true, than that the angel, here men-
“ tioned, was the redeeming angel; of whom it
“ is said, For my name is in him: the same who
“ said unto Jacob, I am the God of Bethel; and
“ of whom it is here said, And God called unto
“ him. The reason why the term, angel, is ap-
“ plied to him, is on account of his government
“ of the world. Thus it is written, And the
“ Lord caused us to go forth out of Egypt;
“ whilst it is equally written, And he sent his
“ angel, and caused us to go forth out of
“ Egypt. It is said, moreover, And the angel of
“ his presence saved them, that is to say, the
“ angel, who is the same with his presence; as it
“ is written, My presence shall go, and I will
“ cause thee to have rest. The same is he of whom
“ it is said; But God shall suddenly come to his
“ temple, the Lord whom ye seek, and the angel
“ of the covenant in whom ye delight, for certain

“ will come.” The angel, here described, is not expressly denominated the Metatron ; but that he and no other, is to be understood, will appear manifest from the observations of the author on that celebrated text, Behold I send the angel before thee to guard thee in the way.*

וְעַל דָּרֶךְ הָאָמֶת הַמֶּלֶךְ הַזֶּה שְׁהַוּבְתָּהוּ בּוֹ בְּכָאן הוּא הַמֶּלֶךְ הַגּוֹאֵל אֲשֶׁר הַשֵּׁם הַגְּדוֹלָה בְּקָרְבָוּ כִּי בֵּית הָאָזְרָן עֲוֹלָמִים וְהָוָא שָׁאָמֵר אֲנָכִי הַאֵל בֵּית אֶל כִּי דָרֶךְ הַמֶּלֶךְ לְשִׁכּוֹן בְּבֵיתוֹ וַיַּקְרָאֵנוּ הַכְּתוּב מֶלֶךְ בְּעַבוּר הַיּוֹת כָּל הַנְּהָנָת הַעֲלָם הַזֶּה בְּמִדְתָּה הַהִיא וְרַבּוֹתֵינוּ אָמְרוּ כִּי הוּא מַטְרָוֵן וְהָוָא שֵׁם לְמֹרֶה הַדָּרֶךְ וְכָבֵר פְּרַשְׁתֵּי זֶה בְּסִדר בָּא אֶל פְּרָעָה : “ In truth, this “ angel, in whom they are here made to confide, “ is the angel of redemption ; in the midst of “ whom is the great name, Jehovah ; for in Jah “ Jehovah is a rock of ages. The same is he “ who said, I am the God of Bethel ; because it “ is the custom of a king to dwell in his palace. “ The scripture styles him an angel, by reason of “ the whole government of this world being “ placed in that predicament, that is to say, in the “ ministration of angels. Moreover, our Fathers “ affirm, that he is the Metatron ; a name signi- “ fying the director of the road, and which I have “ already expounded in the section, Go in unto “ Pharaoh.” The exposition, to which he

* Com. Ex. xxiii. 20.

ובכל אלהו מצרי אעשה alludes, is as follows.* שפטיזולא עי' השליח השלוח מאתוית' לכל המעשים בארץ והוא המלאך הנдол הנקר' בעבו' בן מטרון כי פי' המלה מורה הדרך כמו שאם' בספר אכבע של הקבה נעשה מטרון למשה והראחו כל הארץ ישראל ובילמדנו וישמע בלק כי בא בלעם שלחה מטרון לפניו ועוד שם ראה החלותיו תחת לפניו אי אכפת לך אני מטרון שלך ולא תחתמה שהרי אני עתיד לעשות מטרור לפניו אדם ערל לפניו כורש שנאמ' אני לפניו לך לפני אשה אני עתיד לקדם לפני דבורה וברק שנאמ' הלא י' יצא לפניו וכן במקומו' רבים וכן שמעתי כי שליח בלשון יון מטרור :

“ And on all the gods of Egypt will I inflict judgments ; but not by the hand of the legate, to be sent from the Lord for the achievement of all the exploits, to be wrought in the land ; and who is the great angel, called for that reason the Metatron ; the import of the term being, the director of the road ; as it is said in *Siphre*, ‘ The finger of God became a Metatron to Moses, and shewed him all the land of Israel. So also in *Yelammedenu*, on the words, And Balak heard that Balaam had come ; the gloss is, that he had sent a Metatron before him. So again, in the same page ; Behold I begin to move before thee : if thou turnest thyself, I am thy Metatron ; nor wonder at this, for behold I shall

* Com. Ex. xii. 12.

“ do the office of a Metator before a man, not
“ circumcised, even before Cyrus, as it is said in
“ scripture; I will march before thee: before a
“ woman, too, shall I have to march, even before
“ Deborah and Barak, as it is said in scripture;
“ Did not Jehovah proceed before thee? So also
“ in many other places. I have heard, too, that
“ in the Greek language the word, Metator, sig-
“ nifies a legate.” These passages produced by
the author, though he is doubtless in an error
with respect to the Greek language, do plainly
testify, that with the ancient Jewish Fathers the
term Metatron, was taken in the sense of a pre-
cursor, or a guide of the road; and that the
great angel was so denominated by them, on
account of the commission which he had given
him to conduct the Israelites into the land of
Canaan. This, I think, we ought to regard as
the proper signification of the appellative, Meta-
tron; but as we have to decide on the quality of
the personage, to whom the Fathers gave this
name, and not on the etymology of the name
itself, it is wholly a matter of indifference to us,
from what source it may be derived, or what may
be its acceptation in the original dialect.

That the Jewish divines, owing to their incon-
petency in the learned languages, are by no
means consistent on this point; we have a sin-

gular proof in the case of R. Levi ben Gersom ; whose testimony of the Metatron I shall next produce, not for the purpose of arguing a different etymology, but for the sake of shewing the transcendent honor and dignity, which he expressly ascribes to this divine subsistency.*

והנה קרא הש"י אב כאמרו הלא הוא אביך קנד וראמ הוא השכל הפועל אשר באמצעותו הנעה הנבואה והמשילו אל הנקבה ביחס אל הש"י כי הוא שיקבל הכה מمنו והש"י הוא הפועל השלימות לו כטעם אמרו בעטרה שעדרה לו אמו לזאת הסבה קראוה זיל מטטרון שהוא אם בלשון רומי : "Behold he " calls Jehovah, father : according to the scripture : Is not thy possessor thy father? But the mother is the intellectual agent ; through the medium of which prophecy comes to us. He assimilates it, in reference to Jehovah, to a female ; as it is that which receives virtue from him ; and Jehovah it is that effectuates the perfections of it ; according to the meaning of the text : With the crown wherewith his mother crowned him. For this cause, our Fathers of blessed memory have denominated it the Metatron, the same with mater, or mother, in the Latin tongue." It may be permitted me, perhaps, to observe, without any disparagement to the fame of this learned commentator, that

* Com. Prov. i. 8.

in applying the term, mother, to the Metatron, and in making it the author of prophecy, he has deviated from the conduct of other theologists ; and especially of the Cabballists, who often, indeed, speak of the Habitation, as the celestial mother ; but never once, I think, of the Metatron : though in doing this, as will hereafter be more clearly developed in the subsequent chapters, he has only ascribed to one divine person what, with more propriety, would have been ascribed to another ; a species of blame, which writers of the Christian, as well as of the Jewish church, have frequently incurred.

To the preceding authorities I must add that of Abarbinel ; whose sentiments on the origin and quality of this illustrious being will be regarded with interest.*
 והנה המלאך הזה אשר זכר היה הכוונה בו שכל נבדל ינ hinge בדעתו ובחירה לא שייה במדרגת הכלוי אלא במדרגת המנהיג הפועל שנ hinge במקומות הקב"ה כל הימים שילכו במדבר עד בואם אל הארץ נושבת אשר יי' דורש אותה וחבטולים שזכורתי לדעת הזה הנה חיתרם הוא בזו הדרך אם הא' והוא היהות העם הנבחר שוא לשאר האומות בלי יתרון כלל באוטם הימים שתהיה הנחנתו אומר שגם באוטם ימי המדבר היהת מעלה ישראל עם המלאך הנואל אותם ביתר שעת יותר עז משאר האומות וזה אם

* Com. Ex. xxiii. 20.

מצד המנהיג ואם מצד ההננה אם מצד המנהיג
 לפי שהמלאך השלוח לישראל היה העול הראשון
 היושב ראשונה במלכות ששמו בשם רבים משפט
 ביתר השרים כלם אמנים מנהיני שאר האומות
 היו העולמים האחראונים המושפעים ממנו ובצד
 ההננה כי הנה שאר המלאכים תהיה ההננתם
 לאומותיהם כפי טבע הארץ ושות תולדותיהם
 מהמערכה השמיית אמנים המלאך השלוח לישראל
 ינהגם על פי התורה צוה לנו משה וככפי מה שיקים
 כל אחד מהם חוקי האלים ותורתיו ככה תהיה
 הצלחתו אף שננד לענן הטבע והמערכ' השמיית
 ותהיה ערך ההננתו לקיום המצוות כערך שאר השרים
 ולמערכה השמיית כי כמו שהם ישבו את המונחני
 של"ה אל אשר יהיה שמה רוח המזול והמערכה ככה
 המלאך המנהיג לישראל ינהגם כפי מה שיקימו
 התורה ומצוותיה ולכון היה המלאך והוא העול
 הראשון שיוכל לשנות בחכמת בוארו סדריו המערבה
 השמיית : But, behold with respect to the
 angel here mentioned, the design was, that, as
 he was an abstract intelligency, he should
 govern them according to his own opinion and
 free choice; not that he should be considered
 in the light of an instrument, but as a ruling
 agent, who, in the place of God, should govern
 and direct them, during the whole of the time
 that they might be marching in the desert, till
 they should arrive at the habitable country,
 which the Lord had in view for them. The

“ objections as before stated to this opinion will
“ admit of a solution in the following manner.
“ First, as to the people being chosen, and yet
“ during the period of his government only on
“ an equality with the rest of the nations, with-
“ out any superiority whatever; I would reply,
“ that even during their abode in the desert the
“ condition of Israel with the angel, their re-
“ deemer, was accompanied with a degree of ex-
“ cellency and power far beyond other nations,
“ as well with respect to the governor, as with
“ respect to the government: with respect to
“ the governor; for the angel, that was sent to
“ Israel; is the primary effect or emanation from
“ the godhead, sitting the first in the kingdom,
“ having his name the same with that of his mas-
“ ter, and diffusing his energy in a manner supe-
“ rior to all the princes; whereas the governors of
“ other nations are but secondary effects or emana-
“ tions, deriving their energy from him: so also
“ with respect to the government; for the govern-
“ ment, of the other angels over their several
“ nations is according to the nature of the climate
“ and the hours of their nativities, from the dis-
“ position of the heavens; whereas the angel,
“ sent to Israel, governs them according to the
“ Law which Moses commanded us; and in pro-
“ portion as every man conforms to the statutes

“ and Laws of God, so shall he prosper, though
 “ it be contrary to the laws of nature, or the
 “ disposition of the heavens; the tendency of his
 “ government being to establish the precepts, in
 “ the same degree that the tendency of the
 “ government of the other princes is with the
 “ disposition of the heavens; for as they con-
 “ vert those, whom they govern, whithersoever
 “ the spirit of the constellation and the planets
 “ direct, so doth the angel, that rules Israel,
 “ govern them in such a manner, that they may
 “ fulfil the law and its precepts; and for that
 “ reason it is, that this angel is the primary
 “ effect, in order that he may be able, by the
 “ wisdom of his creator, to change the order of
 “ the planetary system.” Though the angel
 here described, is no where in the whole of this
 quotation expressly called the Metatron; yet he
 is so styled in the subsequent pages: but if even
 that had not been the case, it would have been a
 matter of no importance; as the question is not
 about the name, but the person; and that this
 is the same with the Metatron of the Talmudists,
 there can be no doubt with those, who have any
 knowledge of the subject.

Finally, R. Elias Levita corroborates by his
 authority, what has thus been advanced.* מטטרון

* Tishbi, p. 195.

שר הפנים אומרים שהוא המלך הרואה תמיד
פני המלך יתعلاה ועליו נאמר כי שמי בקרבו ששמו
כשם רבו מטטרון בנטיראה שדי ושמעתוי
מהקדינאל תלמידי כי מטטר בלשון יון שליח
ואולי בן הוּא : The Metatron the prince of the
“divine presence. The Fathers assert, that it
“is the angel, who always beholds the face of the
“king of heaven ; and of whom it is said in
“scripture : For my name is in him ; as his name
“is the same with that of his master, *Metatron*
“being, in gemetry, *Shaddai*, the Almighty. I
“have been told by a cardinal, who was a pupil
“of mine, that in Greek *metator* signifies a
“legate: and, perhaps, it is so.” The reference
to the Greek, I think, might have been omitted ;
if not for the credit of the author himself, who
evidently makes no pretensions to a knowledge of
the language ; at least for the honor of the cardin-
al, who ought to have known better, than to
make any such assertion.

There is now before us, in support of what has
been premised on the doctrine of the Metatron,
such a collection of evidence as justly to warrant
the conclusion ; that in nothing is the Jewish
church so uniform and consistent with herself, as
in the belief, that the Metatron is a divine and
eternal subsistency. For to assert, that he was
created the first of all intelligences anterior to

the worlds, that his power and authority extend to every part of the universe, that he is the primary emanation of the godhead, that his name is Jehovah and Almighty, and that wherever he manifests his presence, the glory of the Habitation attends him; what is it but to maintain, that he is very god of very god, of the same light, essence, or substance, with the supreme being, from whom he emanated, and coeternal with him; for, if he subsisted before the creation of the world, he must have subsisted for ever; there being no difference in metaphysics between subsisting before the commencement of time, which is but an accident of the material world, and subsisting from eternity?

But admitting, that the angel, Metatron, is a personality of the godhead; it may next be demanded, how the trinitarian hypothesis can thus be established; as we do not maintain the belief of one, or two; but of three divine subsistences. To this I reply, that with the Metatron there must of necessity be numbered the Jehovah himself, whose name he bears; to which if we add the Habitation, of whom casual mention has been made in this chapter, we shall then have a trinity of personalities, all equally partaking of one common essence; nor is it possible to think otherwise, as the godhead is purely emanative,

and these I shall demonstrate to be its primordial subsistences. That the Habitation is a divine personality, as well as the Metatron, might have been now proved at one and the same time; but as this will be more conveniently done in a subsequent chapter, I for the present content myself with having set forth the doctrine of the Metatron; and advance to the prosecution of what comes next in order.

CHAPTER IX.

IT was, doubtless, the necessity of supposing the godhead to exist in a plurality of persons, that impelled the Cabbalists to invent the doctrine of the ten numerations, as they are commonly called; and, with the school of Pythagoras, to look upon number, in a manner, as the essence of every thing. The metaphysical subtlety, with which this doctrine has been laid down and maintained, excites the highest admiration. But as the plan of the present work requires no farther account of it, than as may immediately affect the truth of the general Proposition; I shall content myself with premising, that the doctrine of the ten numerations is founded, in a great measure, on the principles of arithmetic. In this art, by

means of its ten figures or characters, the highest numbers are expressed without exceeding the ten; as ten units make a ten, ten tens a hundred, ten hundred a thousand, ten thousand a myriad, and so on, agreeably to the principles of numeration, in which every ten, ascending, acquires a new denomination commencing with unity. So the ten numerations of the Cabbalists, like the ten figures of arithmetic, are supposed to comprise the divine nature, together with all things pertaining to it; and seem to imply, that every thing which subsists in the universe, is to be included in the being and attributes of God. Moreover, as in arithmetic the cypher, which is the foundation of all number, tells for nothing, except in conjunction with the other figures; so in the doctrine of the ten numerations, the Supreme Crown or Diadem, which is the first of them, and which by reason of its being used to denote the form of God considered in the abstract, is frequently called the Infinity, or the Nothing; cannot be reckoned separately by itself, but only in conjunction with the other numerations, to which it is the causation both of number and existence. From the order and manner, however, in which we find them classed and distinguished; a trinity of persons subsisting in the Godhead, is plainly recognized. The first numeration, as has

been already noticed, they style the Supreme Crown ; being so called from the many resplendent gems, supposed to be shining in it, and from which all other natures, however glorious or transcendent, derive their lustre : the second they term, Wisdom ; and the third, Understanding ; each of which is invariably described as a spiritual and intellectual subsistency from eternity, and as preserving its own proper form in that of the godhead. The remaining seven are denominated, Mercy, Severity, Beauty, Victory, Glory, Stability, and Sovereignty ; and are termed the inferior numerations, being regarded as mere attributes which the higher numerations, Supreme Crown, Wisdom, and Understanding, possess in common with each other. This doctrine of the ten numerations is repeatedly inculcated in the book of Creation, composed, as is vulgarly thought, by Abraham, the patriarch ; from which, as from a fountain, is derived all the learning, that has been displayed on the subject by modern Cabballists. But in order that the account, which has been now given of them, may be properly attested ; I shall set before the reader, as many authorities at least, as will render the matter, at once, clear and satisfactory. Only, for the better understanding of the passages to be recited, it may not be improper to admonish him, that the

plural term, which has been thus far rendered, numerations ; is, by some authors, translated, lights, or splendors ; and commented on as such, in their development of the doctrine. Nor is it to be denied, that, as often as the deity is considered under the notion of a resplendent substance, diffusing itself from a point or center into so many ramifications or modes of light, as there are counted numerations ; the latter way of rendering the term by, lights, or, splendors, is rather to be preferred.

The names of the inferior numerations vary somewhat in different authors ; but, in general, they accord with what has been just premised of them, as the subjoined illustrations on the subject, from the author of *Tykune Sohar*, will abundantly testify : *

פתח אליהו ואמר רבון עליים דאנת
 הוא חד ולא ביחסן אתה הואعلاה על כל
 علاון סתימא על כל סתימין לית מחשבה תפיסא
 בעך כל אתה הוא דאפיקת עשר תקוניין וקורין לו
 עשר ספרין לאננהא בהון עליין סתימין דלא
 אהנליין וועלמין דאתנליין ובהון אתבסיאת מבני
 נשא אתה הוא דקשיר לו ומייחד לו ובנין דאנת
 מלנאו כל מאן דאפריש חד מן חבריה מאלון עשר
 אתחשב לוהכאילו אפריש בעך וואלון עשר ספרין איננו
 אולון בסדרון חד אריך וחד קצר וחד בינוינו אתה הוא
 דאנהין לו ולית מאן דאנהין לך לא לעילא ולא למטה

* *Tykune Sohar*, p. 13, Amst. ed.

ולא מכל סטרא לבושין תקינת לון דמניווּהו פרחין
 נשמתין לבני נשא וכמה נופין תקינת לון דאתקריאו
 נופא לבושין דמכסין עליוון ואתקריאו בתקונא דא
 חסד דרוועא ימיא נבורה דרוועא שמאלא תפארת
 נופא נצח והוד תריין שוקין ויסוד סיומה דנופא אוט
 בריות קדש מלכות פה תורה שביעפ קריין ליה מוחא
 הכמה איהו מחשבה מלנו בינה לבא ובה מבין ועל
 “אלין תריין כתיב הנסתרות לי” :
 “and said; Master of the worlds, thou art one,
 “but not by calculation; thou art supreme above
 “all supremes, and mysterious above all mys-
 “teries; there is no thought, which can at all
 “apprehend thee. Thou hast produced the ten
 “constitutions, called by us the ten numerations,
 “wherewith to govern as well those worlds which
 “are invisible, as those which are visible; and
 “by which thou hast enveloped thyself from the
 “children of men. Thou hast bound, and united
 “them together; and since thou existest in the
 “midst, whosoever divideth the one from the
 “other of those ten, is to be reputed the same
 “as though he had divided thee. Those ten
 “numerations move in their order; one long,
 “and one short, and one betwixt the two.
 “Thou governest them; but there is none that
 “governeth thee, neither above, nor below, nor
 “on any side whatever. Garments hast thou
 “appointed for them, as from them issue the souls

“ unto the children of men ; and numerous bodies
 “ hast thou appointed for them, as the garments,
 “ with which they cover themselves, are denom-
 “ nated body ; and they are called, in this Tykun,
 “ Mercy, the right arm ; Might, the left arm ;
 “ Beauty, the body ; Victory and Glory, the
 “ two legs ; Foundation, the sum or fulcrum of
 “ the body, the sign of the holy covenant ; King-
 “ dom, the mouth, the law which is called oral ;
 “ Wisdom, the brain, that is, thought from out
 “ of it ; Understanding, the heart with under-
 “ standing in it. But of these two last it is
 “ written : The hidden things belong unto the
 “ Lord.” So again, in another part of the same
 work :* כד נחית ק"בָה ב"קָש אַתָּמָר בְּחַיּוֹן וְאַשְׁמָע
 את קול כנפיים בעשר מני תלים בשיר פשוט דאייהו
 כתר כפול דאייהו יק הכמה וbijינה מושלש ביקוּ
 דאייהו חסד נבורה הפארת מרובע ביקוק דאייהו
 נצח הוּד יסוד מלכות דנטריין צפרא קדישא ישראל
 בינויו וקראן בה לישראל דאייהו עמודא דאמצעיתא :
 “ When the Lord descendeth, during the reading
 “ of the Shema ; it is said of the living creatures,
 “ And I heard the voice of their wings, in ten
 “ species of psalms ; in the song simple, which
 “ is, *Jod*, that is, the Crown ; in the song double,
 “ which is, *Jod, He*, that is, Wisdom and Under-
 “ standing ; in the song triple, by or with, *Jod* ;

* Ibidem, p. 3.

“ *He, Vau*, that is, Mercy, Might, and Beauty ; “ in the song quadruple, with *Jod, He, Vau, He*, “ that is, Victory, Glory, Foundation, and King- “ dom ; which keep among them the holy bird, “ Israel ; and call Israel by it, that is, the central “ column.” This author is, indeed, replete with the doctrine of the ten numerations ; and whenever there is full mention made of them, the above denotation and order are generally retained.

That the Supreme Crown is the godhead itself, diffused through the whole of the numerations, and that, when numbered with wisdom and understanding, it forms a trinity of numerations, which are considered as prior, and in all respects superior, to the rest ; are positions of which the same learned Cabbalist has exhibited the clearest proof, in the passages that follow :*

אבל שם יקוק איהו מרכבה למאיריה לבחר
 עלאה ובניין דא אין קדוש כי עלה על כלא טמיר
 וגניז בכתיר ומניה אתפישיט נהוריה על יקוק דאייהו
 י’ חכמה ה’ בינה ו’ כליל שית ספרון ה’ מלכות :
 “ But the name, Jehovah, is the chariot which
 “ makes manifest the Supreme Crown ; and, there-
 “ fore, there is none holy like Jehovah, who is
 “ exalted above every thing, being hidden and
 “ concealed in the Crown ; and from which his
 “ light is diffused unto the Jehovah, that is to say,

* *Tykune Sohar*, p. 5.

“ unto the *Jod*, Wisdom ; *He*, Understanding ;
 “ *Vau*, the whole of the six numerations next in
 “ order ; and *He*, Kingdom.” So in another part :*
 הרוי ספרות אתקריאו בשם יקוק ובשם אד' ואינו
 אתבריאו ובנין דא אית שמהן דמיין לחותמא דמלכ'
 דבහון אשתמודע דזוקנא דמלכ' ומטרונית ציר'
 ממש ואית שמהן דאנון בנונ' דרשימו דצירוא
 דחותמא בשעה וחייב דחילין מההוא רשיימו כאילו
 הוּא מלכ' ממש אבל אדון על כלא לית ליה מכל אלין
 צירין כלל : Behold the numerations are called
 “ by the name, Jehovah ; and by the name
 “ Adonai. The former are created, and there-
 “ fore their names resemble the seal of the king,
 “ with which is expressed the effigy of the king,
 “ and the consort, in a real figure ; but the names
 “ of the latter are, as it were, the exaration of
 “ the figure of the seal in wax ; and so they fear
 “ that exaration, as though it were literally the
 “ king. Nevertheless, the Lord over all has not
 “ any of those figures.” So again :†
 בתר אל עליון קונה הכל חכמה ובינה אלקינו
 אתקריו אל עליון קונה הכל חכמה ובינה אלקינו
 בינה ואלקי אבותינו חכמה ואיהו אלקי אברהם אלקי
 יצחק ואלקי יעקב האל הנדול מסטרא גנדולה
 והגבור מסטרא גנברורה והנורא מסטרא דעמודא
 דאמצעיתא : The Crown is called the Most :
 “ High, possessing all things ; and as to Wisdom
 “ and Understanding, Understanding is called

* Ibidem.

† Tyk. 70, p. 122.

“ our God, but Wisdom the God of our Fathers ;
 “ the same with the God of Abraham, the God of
 “ Isaac, and the God of Jacob ; the great God,
 “ in respect of greatness ; the mighty God, in
 “ respect of might ; and the formidable God, in
 “ respect of the central column.” To the above
 many other passages of a similar complexion
 might easily be added ; but these, for the present,
 will be considered sufficient.

The author, however, who of all others has developed the doctrine of the numerations in the most clear and satisfactory manner, is R. Bechai ; whose language, on account of the importance of the subject, I shall cite at full length.*

על דרך הקבלה בראשית בראש אליהם את השמים ואת הארץ יש בכתב זה סוד עשר ספירות וחמשים והארץ דם השמי והארץ העליונים שאינם מכל הנגלים והם הנקראים שמי קדם וארץ החיים ומלה בראשית תרמו אל החכמה בענין שכחוב ראשית החכמה וכן הבית רמו לחכמה שהוא שנייה בספריו והרו לך מלת בראשית האות הראשונה והמלת דם עדות על החכמה ולפי שהכל נמדד ונאצל מן החכם' באה' הבית רבתינו ואפ' על פי שהוא שנייה בספריו' ראשנו' היא לענין הישנתנו וזה פירוש בית של בראשית חכמה שהוא ראשית שהרי הספרה הקורמת לה אין אנו רשאי להרהר בה ולכך נקראת אין וזה ווחכמה מאין תמצא על דרך ההודעה לא על דרך

* Com. Gen. p. 5, col. 2.

שאלה ומ' מ Normot היא בעוקצ'ו של בית ומזה דרישו
 חבמי האמת אומרים לבית מי ברא' מרא' להן
 בעוקצ'ה כ לפ' "lf" שהוא הכתיר ודע והבן כי עלת
 העולות למעלה מן הכתיר וזהו אמר ספר יצירה עשר
 ספרי בלי מה עשר ולא תשע עשר ולא אחת עשר
 פירוש עשר ולא תשע שהרי הכתיר יש' לחשוב מן
 הכל לפי שביל שאר הספרו' נמשכות ממנה כי הוא
 מקד' נובע שהכל תלוי בו עש' ולא אחת עשרה
 לפי ישין לחשוב מן הכל מה למעלה מן הכתיר והוא
 עלת העולות והוא דבר נעלם אין לומר עליו לא יש' ולא
 אין וזה לשון עשר כפירות בלי מה עשר ספרות של
 בלי מה כלומר נאצלות מבלי מה ומזה הצריכו חכמי
 האמי' קוצו' של יוד' שהוא רמז לעלת העולות שהוא
 למעלה מכל העשר' וכיון שביל העש' הם האצלות
 הנה המאצל שהוא עלת העולות נפרד מהן וזה
 פירוש י' ולא אחת עשרה ומה שבתוכו שם בספר
 יצירה חוק ולא חזבי' מי ה חוק בכוונה על הכתיר
 כי הדבר ה חוק הם נ' ספרי שהם נ' "אותיו' של שם
 שחักק הכתיר והן יה'ו' שהן אותיות מתברכות
 וمبرכות כל מתברך והם נ' ספר ספר וספר
 ספר היא החכמ' וקראה ספר לפ' שהדורות הולבי'
 ואין החכמ' נשארת כי אם על יוד' ספר ומזה נקראת
 אף החכמ' העליזונה ספר ספר הוא הבינה שאדם
 מונה בה והוא מלישון ספרה ומני' וכן אמר הכתוב
 בדבריו הימים וספר שלמה את כל האנשים הנירים
 אשר בארץ ישראל אחריו הספר אשר ספרם דוד אביו
 ספר הוא אשר הספרות שאפשר לבני אדם להשיג
 ולדבר בהם יודע'י הספר הוא היוד' ספר היא ה'היא

ספרור הוא ה"או והוא התפארת שהוא מדה ששית
והבן וכבר ידעת כי מלת ספר' חשבונה שם' ואם כן
שלשה ספרי' הם שלשה שמות של שכל וاعפי'
שכחותיה' רבים שלשיהם עקר אחד להם וכן נ'
אותיות של שם הנה הם עקר אחד ויצאו מעיקר אחד
הוא החוקק העלים הוא הכתיר שהוא נمشך מעלה
העלות הנקרה אין סוף ויש לך להתבונן בפרשת
مراה כמה שאם' הכתו' שם שם לו חוק ומשפט ושם
נסחו אלהי' התשובה והוא בראש העולם ואלו כוונת
תפלתנו בראש השנה ומה שכתוב ויתפלל אברם
אל האלים על ה"א אחרונה נאמר וכן אמר דוד ע"ה
אני אל אלהים אקרא ועל התשובה נאמר כי אם
לבינה תקרא והתשובה נקרה בינה שהוא נתוני'
“ But according to the
“ doctrine of the Cabbala, there is contained in
“ the pasuk, In the beginning God created the
“ heavens and the earth, the mystery of the ten
“ numerations; the heavens and the earth being
“ interpreted of the highest heavens and earth,
“ which form no part of the spheres, but are
“ called, the one the heavens of old, and the
“ other the earth, or the land, of the living.
“ The expression, In or By the beginning, repre-
“ sents Wisdom; according to the text, The
“ beginning of wisdom. So likewise the letter,
“ Beth, represents Wisdom; it being the second
“ amongst the numerations. Behold, then, in the
“ expression, By the beginning; two testimonies

“ for Wisdom. Because every thing was deduced,
“ and emanated from Wisdom, the capital *Beth*
“ appears; and although it is only second amongst
“ the numerations, yet in respect of our own
“ apprehension it is the first; so that the true
“ import of the *Beth* in, By the beginning, is
“ Wisdom, which is, indeed, the beginning; for
“ of the numeration preceding it we can form no
“ conception, and it is, therefore, called Nothing,
“ according to the text, But Wisdom is found of
“ Nothing; the sentence being considered as
“ explicative, not interrogative. Nevertheless,
“ it is represented by the cusp of the *Beth*.
“ Hence theologists give the following allegorical
“ exposition. They say to *Beth*, Who created
“ thee? She gives them to see, by her cusp, in
“ the form of *Aleph*; which is the Crown.
“ Moreover, know and understand, that the cause
“ of causes is above the Crown; and this is the
“ language of *Sepher Jetsira*, Ten numerations
“ of Nothing, ten not nine, ten not eleven;
“ meaning by, ten not nine, that the Crown is to
“ be taken into the aggregate account; because
“ from it are drawn the other numerations, as it
“ is the emanating fountain on which they
“ severally depend. But he says, ten not eleven,
“ because what may not be reckoned as a part of
“ the whole, must be something above the Crown;

“ and that is the cause of causes, which is alto-
“ gether concealed, and of which we can neither
“ say, that it is, nor that it is not. The meaning
“ of the words, Ten numerations of Nothing, is,
“ Ten numerations from Nothing ; that is to say,
“ emanated from Nothing. Hence theologists
“ require the top of the Jod ; as it represents the
“ cause of causes, which is above all the ten.
“ Indeed, since all the ten are emanations ; most
“ unquestionably that which causes them to ema-
“ nate, that is to say, the cause of causes, must be
“ different from them. Such is the sense of the
“ expression, ten but not eleven. But with re-
“ spect to what is further asserted in the same
“ *Sepher Jetsira*, that he inscribed, but without
“ mentioning, who was the inscriber ; that, doubt-
“ less, is to be understood of the Crown ; as the
“ thing inscribed is the three *sephers*, which are
“ the three letters of the name inscribed by the
“ Crown ; they being *Jod, He, Vau*, which are
“ the letters blessed, and blessing every one that
“ is blessed. They are, moreover, denominated
“ Numberer, Number, and Numbered. Num-
“ berer is Wisdom ; called Numberer, because
“ generations pass away, and there is no
“ wisdom left but by means of the scribe or
“ numberer. For this reason, the celestial Wis-
“ dom is called Numberer. Number is Under-

“ standing ; by which man counts, and which
“ has the signification of numeration and number.
“ Thus we read in the book of **Chronicles** ; And
“ Solomon numbered all the men, that were
“ strangers in the land of Israel, after the num-
“ ber that his father **David** had numbered. Num-
“ bered is the rest of the numerations ; of which
“ it is possible for mankind to form any notion or
“ to speak. Be it known, too, that **Numberer**
“ is *Jod* ; **Number** is *He* ; and **Numbered** is
“ *Vau*, that is, **Beauty**, which is the sixth attribute
“ or property. This observe. Moreover, you
“ are already aware, that the term, *sepher*, is of
“ the same numerical value with, *shem*, the name ;
“ and, therefore, these three *sephers* are the three
“ names of intelligency ; and though their powers
“ are many, yet they have all but one origin or
“ root. So likewise, the three letters of the name
“ are one root ; and have issued from one root,
“ which is the sculptor of the world ; the same
“ with the Crown, deduced from the cause of
“ causes, called the **Infinity**. It is worthy of your
“ consideration, too, what the scriptures say in
“ section, *Mara* ; There he set for them a statute,
“ and an ordinance ; and there he tried them.
“ **Elohim**, **God**, is **Returning** ; which created the
“ world ; and to him is our prayer directed, on
“ the commencement of the **New Year**. So

“ with respect to the passage, And Abraham
 “ prayed unto the Elohim; there is mention made
 “ of *He*, the latter numeration. So likewise of
 “ David it is written; I will call unto Elohim.
 “ Now, of Returning it is said; If thou wilt call
 “ unto Understanding; the numeration, Return-
 “ ing, being denominated Understanding, because
 “ it stands under the first two, or is placed be-
 “ tween the first five numerations.” It is here
 worthy of remark, that, with R. Bechai, the third
 numeration is indiscriminately termed either
 Returning, or Understanding; a case, I believe,
 peculiar to himself: in other respects, he unques-
 tionably coincides with the great body of the
 Cabbalists.

R. Shabtai,* viewing the godhead in the abstract, the three minds or personalities, in which it exists; and the seven attributes or properties belonging to the minds, as three distinct orders or ranks of existency; has thus described them: *סוד מדרינה ראשונה* סוד הנקודה מדראינה שנייה *סוד מדרינה שנייה* שלישית סוד התפשטות המוחות *סוד מדרינה שלישית* שבין הכל עשר ספירותיהם אח'ית שליש ו' והנה מצד זה כלם אח'ות נמור כי הנקודה התנלה בחינותיה ב' מוחות ו' מוחות נחנלו ב' ספירות ומה שנמצא ב' ספירות ימצא ב' מוחות

* Thus cited by Rittangel in his edition of *Sepher Jetsira* but without any references.

ומה שימצא בנו מוחרי ימצא באחדות הנקודה ומה
 שימצא באחדות הנקוד' ימצא בא"ס ב"ה : " The
 " first order is the mystery of the central point ;
 " the second order is the mystery of the three
 " minds ; the third order is the mystery of the dif-
 " fusion of the three minds into seven nume-
 " rations : all which make up ten numerations ; for
 " they are, one, three, and seven. But, in this
 " respect, they are still all of them a perfect unity ;
 " for the central point manifests itself, with its three
 " intelligences, in the three minds ; and the three
 " minds are manifested in the seven numerations ;
 " and whatever exists in the seven numerations,
 " exists in the three minds, and whatever exists
 " in the three minds, exists in the unity of the
 " central point ; and whatever exists in the unity
 " of the central point, exists in the Infinity,
 " blessed be he." That the Supreme Crown, or
 the divinity considered in the abstract, is not to be
 reckoned alone, but only in company with the
 other numerations, of which it is the first in order ;
 the same learned author * has not failed to inform
 לנו כן כת' הנם שהוא לבודו בפני עצמו אינו
 מספר כדירשנו למעלה כי אינו דומה למספרות
 עיכו מצד מספר הנאצלים ריל כמספר כמה הם
 הנאצלים נס הוא נכנס בנדיר המספר להרות כי
 נס הוא נאצל ונבוה מעל נבוה שמר ונבוח עלייה'

* Ibidem.

לכך בא במספר עם שאר הנאצלים להיו' נמנה
 בראש מעשרה הראשונים הקדושים כי נם הוא
 נאצל כמו זה ונכנס בנדר הנאצלים כי אין ביה הוא
 שורש של כל השרשים המתאה' בכלן ומתרפש
 בכלן והוא בינהו ובחוכמו וחוץ מהן ולכל צדי צדיהם
 “In like : and he is not number :
 “manner as to the Crown, although alone, and
 “in respect of itself, it be no number, as we have
 “expounded it above, because it is unlike the
 “numerations ; nevertheless, in respect of the
 “number of emanations, that is to say, when we
 “reckon up, how many emanations there are ; it
 “is included in the consideration of the number,
 “to indicate that it, also, is an emanation ; and
 “that there is a lofty one, watching above the
 “lofty one ; and lofty ones above them ; therefore,
 “is it taken into account with the other ema-
 “nations, so as to be reckoned at the head of the
 “ten first holy ones : for it is also an emanation,
 “as well as they, and is taken into the consi-
 “deration of the number of emanations ; as the
 “Infinity, blessed be he, is the root of all roots,
 “uniting itself with them all, and diffusing itself
 “through them all ; being both within them,
 “without them, and on all sides of them ; they all
 “standing in need of it, whilst it stands in no need
 “of them.”
— *—* *—* *—* *—* *—* *—* *—* *—* *—* *—*

The Talmudists rarely touch on the subject of

the ten numerations; as being a height in theology, to which they never aspired. R. Samuel Eliezer, nevertheless, in his celebrated commentary on the Gemara, has taken some notice of the doctrine; and, so far as he enters into an explanation of their nature and properties, accords precisely with what has here been laid down.*

בְּיַדְרִים נִבְרָא הָעוֹלָם בְּחִכָּמָה וּבְתִבְונָה כֹּי כַּפֵּי
הָעֵינָן שָׁהֵן הַזֶּה דְּבָרִים דְּחַשֵּׁב הַכָּא שָׁבָחָן נִבְרָא
עַלְיָהּ הַזֶּה בְּשָׁמוֹתֵיהֶן קְדוּבָּה לְשָׁמוֹת עַשְׂרֵה סְפִירֹות
שְׁהַסְכִּימָו בְּהַזֶּן הַמִּקְוָבְּלִי בְּקָרְיאָה שָׁמוֹת וְהַזֶּה
מְאוֹרָה אֲשֶׁר נִבְרָא הָעוֹלָם וּמִוְתֵּה בְּחִכָּמָה
וּבְתִבְונָה דְּכַתִּיב בְּחִכָּמָה יְסֵד אָרֶץ כּוֹן שְׁמִים
בְּתִבְונָה נָנוּ לְפִי שָׁמוֹת הַסְפִירֹות קְדֻמָּה הַכָּמָה לְבִינָה:

“ By ten words or things was the world created,
“ by Wisdom and by Understanding, &c. From
“ considering them, those ten things whereby the
“ world is here supposed to have been created;
“ appear with their names to have some affinity
“ to the names of the ten numerations, to which
“ the Cabbalists, on expressing them by name,
“ uniformly adhere; and those are the ten lights
“ by which, according to their tradition, the world
“ was created; but more especially by Wisdom
“ and Understanding, for which they allege the
“ scripture: By Wisdom hath he founded the
“ earth, establishing the heavens by Understand-

* Com. Een. Yaacob, p. 163, col. 3. Amst. ed.

“ ing ; for, in the names of the Numerations, “ Wisdom takes precedence of Understanding.” Here we have a confirmation, amongst other things, of the remark already made ; that, with many writers, the ten numerations of the god-head are denominated the ten lights.

That the superior numerations are real personalities, and not mere attributes, like the inferior numerations ; is explicitly avowed by R. Menachem Rakanatensis.* אֵיךְ הַשְׁלִשָׁה רָאשָׁנוֹת : “ **הֵם שְׁבֵלוֹת וְלֹא נִקְרָאוּ מִדּוֹת :** ” But the three “ first are intellectual, and are not called properties.” R. Judah Levita,† though he deems strength and other faculties to be properties of the deity ; denies, that his wisdom is a property. וַיִּקְרָא אָתוֹת חַכְמָה לְבָב מִפְנֵי שֶׁהוּא עַצְם הַחֲכָמָה : “ **וְאַין הַחֲכָמָה מִדָּה לָו :** ” So he is said to be wise of “ heart, because he is the very essence of wisdom ; “ wisdom being no property in him.” Nor does R. Bechai allow the superior numerations to be attributes, or properties ; but, in this respect, has well discriminated betwixt them and the rest.‡ וְצִדְקָךְ אַתָּה לְדַעַת כִּי אֲהֵיה הַכּוֹלֵל שְׁתֵי רָאשָׁנוֹת וְעַד אֲהֵיה שֶׁהוּא רָמֶן לְאַשְׁוֹבָה וְעַד אֲהֵיה הַשְׁלִישִׁי בְּלִתְיַא הַהִיא שֶׁהוּא רּוּמֵן לְפָנִים וְיָוָתְרָה שֶׁהוּא

* Cited also by Rittangel but without any references.

† Sepher Cosri, Mem. ii. p. 79.

‡ Com. Ex. iii. 14.

התפארת שלשתם נכלין בשם המפורש כי הירך
 רמז לחכמה עם קוזח הרומו לכתיר הא' לתשובה
 ואיז להתפארת ה"א כננד ה"א מכאו תבין כי השם
 המיויחד שתי אותיות הראשונות הם רמז לאמתתו
 ושתיים אחרונות רמזו למדותיו ועוד התבונן מה
 שהיובתורה שתי אותיות הראשונות שם בפני עצמו
 ולא כן השתים האחרוןות כי אין שם והטעם בזוז
 כי כאשר נזכי שתי הראשונות האחרונות בכללו
 כי הן התחלה ואי אפשר להיות בהן קצוץ אבל
 האחרונות שאינן שם אלו היו שם היה בזוז קצוץ
 ולכך לא נכתבו שתי אחרוני שם בפני עצמו :

“ Moreover it behoves you to know, that, I AM,
 “ takes in the first two numerations; and further,
 “ that, I AM, stands for Returning; and also,
 “ that the third, I AM, without the letters, *He*,
 “ *He*, *Aleph*, stands for inward compassion,
 “ which is the beauty of the whole trinity com-
 “ prehended in the same name; as the *Jod* stands
 “ for Wisdom, together with its point, which
 “ stands for the Crown; *He* stands for Re-
 “ turning; *Vau* for Beauty; and *He* corresponds
 “ with *He*. Hence it is observable, that of the
 “ sacred name, Jehovah, the first two letters
 “ represent his real essence; but the latter two
 “ his attributes. Besides it deserves to be re-
 “ marked, that in the Law the first two letters
 “ form a noun substantive, *Jah*; but not so the
 “ latter two; as they make no name: and the

“ reason of this is, that when we make mention
 “ of the first two, the latter two are compre-
 “ hended; because those are the beginning, and
 “ it is impossible that in them there should be any
 “ separation; but if the latter, which are not a
 “ name, had really been a name, there would have
 “ been a separation of one half of the name from
 “ the other; and, therefore, the latter two letters
 “ are no where written as a substantive.” But the
 proper distinction between the superior and the
 inferior numerations will be best perceived from
 the words of R. Shabtai;* who has compared
 them to the root, stem, and branches of a tree.

המשל בזה האלין שיש לו שורש ומשורש יצא נזע
 ומנזע יצאו ענפים שהם ני מדריגות שורש נזע ענפי
 והכל אילן אחד אך ורק ההבדל ביןיהם ההעלם
 והגלווי כי השורש הוא נעלם מנהה השפעתו בנזע
 ומתחדר בנזע והנזע מנהה השפעתו בענפים
 ומתחדר בענפים המסתעפים ממנו וככל בכלל
 מתחזין ומתחדר בשורש כי לולא השפעת השורש
 הנזע והענפים כלם יתיבשו עד שבubo זה כלם בכלל
 יקרו אילן אחד כמו כן הוא בנדון שלפנינו הכתיר
 שהוא סוד הנקודה הוא השורש הנעלם ומי מוחות
 הם הנזע המתחדים בנקודה שהיא שרשן ווי
 ספירות שהם ענפים מתחדים בנזע שהם המוחות
 וככל בכלל מתחדי בנקודה שהוא השורש בסוד

* Thus cited by Rittangel without any references; though I suspect all the citations from this author to be taken out of Shepha Tal.

שׂוֹרֵשׁ שֵׁם וְעַצְם בְּיַהוָּרֶשׁ מִשְׁפָיעַ בְּכָלֵן וְהַמִּיחָד : “ אֶת כָּלֵן בְּהַשְׁפָעָתוֹ : “ Let the doctrine be illustrated under the figure of a tree. First, there is its root; from the root issues the stem, and from the stem issue the branches; which are three degrees or orders of existence, namely, the root, the stem, and the branches; and yet they are all but one tree. The only difference between them is that of concealment and appearance. For the root is concealed, but manifests its influence in the stem, and unites with it; the stem manifests its influence in the boughs, and unites with them, they branching out of it; whilst they altogether remain fast, and unite themselves to the root: for, were it not for the influx of the root, both the stem and the boughs would wither away; so that for this reason, the whole of them taken together, is denominated one tree. So is it in the case before us. The Crown, which is the same with the central point, is the root concealed; the three minds are the stem, uniting with the central point, which is their root; and the seven numerations, which are the same with the boughs, unite themselves to the stem, that is, to the three minds: whilst they all equally unite with the central point, which is the root, in the mystery of root, name, and substance. For it is the

“ root, which diffuses its influx through them all ; “ and, by that means, unites them into one.”

That each of the higher numerations is a spiritual subsistency, is asserted by R. Moses ben Nachman.* **כת' עליון שהוא קדמון הוא רוח אלהים :** **ח'ים והחכמה היא רוח מרוח ורבינה מים מרוח :** “ The Supreme Crown, which is the first, is the “ spirit of the living God ; Wisdom is the spirit “ of spirit ; and Understanding the waters of “ spirit.” If any doubt should remain, from the preceding testimony, of the numeration, Understanding, being a spiritual subsistency ; the subsequent authority of R. Abraham ben David† will be sufficient to dispel it : **הבינה נקראת רוח מרוח :** “ The Understanding is called spirit of spirit.” So R. Moses Botril : ‡ **שלש מים מרוח ר"ל :** **מים מרוח רוח הוצא מרוח של רוח הקדש היינו :** **روح שלש מן הבורא ית' וממנו נבראו המים :** “ The third is the waters of spirit ; meaning by “ the waters of spirit, the spirit which proceeds “ from the spirit of the spirit of God, that is, “ the third spirit from the blessed creator ; and “ from which were created the waters.” R. Moses Ilpeles,§ too, agrees with this account of the

* Cited by Rittangel without any references.

† Com. on Sepher Jetsira, Perek i. Mishna 10; as cited by Rit.

‡ Com. on Sepher Jetsira, Perek, i. Mishna 10; as cited by Rit.

§ Hoil Mosche, Perek iv. p. 21.

higher numerations; inculcating at the same time, that the, Elohim, mentioned in the first section of Genesis, is Understanding, having emanated from Wisdom, in the manner of all spiritual substances.

או ירצה פ"ג' ב"מ' עד הקבלה זהה כבר ידעת שעולם האצילות הוא על זהה כתר הכמה ובינה וכבר ידעת שכל אלहים שיש במעשה בראשית הוא בינה ופי' שיעיד הכתוב לדעתם על זהה הדרך בראשית שהיא הכמה כדאי' ראשית חכמה יראת ה' בראש הבודא אלהים שהוא עד מיש ז"ל אני היתי ונומר שאמרה התרבות אני היתי בלי אומנותו של הב"ה ובזה יובן היבט האלף אמרה בעבר זה התרבות שלא יאמרו האפיקורוסין שיש ב' רשוות למה לא בראת את עולם ב' ר"ל שנאמר אלהים בראש בראשית אמר ה"ב וה כי אני משנה סדריו בראשית אם מן חכמה שהוא בראשית נאצל בינה שהוא אלהים איך אני אומר בהפן שאלהים שהוא בינה נאצל ממנו : " בראשית שהוא חכמה : " There is a third way of " illustrating, in a satisfactory manner, this expos- " tulation of the letter, Aleph, with the deity, " according to the doctrine of the Cabalists. " It cannot but be already known to you, that the " emanatory world proceeds in the order of, " Crown, Wisdom, and Understanding. It must " be equally known too, that every, Elohim, " which occurs in the history of the creation; is " the same with Understanding. Hence the ex- " plication of the import of the first words of

“ Moses, according to the opinion of the Cabballists; is to this effect. In the beginning, that is, By Wisdom; as it is written: The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom; created the creator Elohim; which accords with the declaration of the inspired penman, I was, and so forth: the Law thus affirming, I was the instrument of the workmanship of God. In this manner may the expostulation be rendered perfectly intelligible. The letter, Aleph, said, for the purpose, that the Epicureans might not assert the existence of two principles; Why hast thou not created thy worlds by me, that is, why is it not said, Elohim created in the beginning? The deity replied: How shall I invert the order of the Beginning? If Understanding, which is the same with Elohim, emanated from Wisdom, which is the same with Beginning; how shall I say contrariwise, that from Elohim, which is Understanding, emanated Beginning, which is Wisdom?”

How distinctly subsisting, and yet how closely associated, this trinity of personalities is supposed to be; will appear from the efforts of the Cabballists to shew, that the very names of the deity imply that number of subsistences. Thus R. Simeon,* speaking of the appellation, יְהָוָה,

* *Tykune Sohar*, Tyk. xlii, fol. 84, col. 1 et 2; as cited by Rit.

כליל תלת ספирן א' כתר י" — חכמה י' בינה
 Nothing ; observes — "חכמה י' בינה" It comprehends the three numerations ; Aleph denotes, Crown ; Jod, Wisdom ; and Nun, Understanding." The same doctrine is likewise inculcated in many of their explications of the sacred text. Thus R. Simeon* on the words of the Psalmist : **אחד דבר אלהים שתים זו שמעתי אחד ושתים הא תלת ספирן עליון** : **דאתמר בהון אחת אחת וחתת תלת אחדין :** "Once, hath God spoken ; twice, have I heard the same. One time, and two times : lo ! these are the three heavenly numerations, of which it is here said, one, one, one ; there being three ones." R. Meir ben Sodros† compares them, in regard of the necessity of their union, with the spiritual, rational, and vital parts of man. **נמצא כיון ראשונות שם כ"ע והה"כמה וה"בינה** : **הם ספירות שכליות ונקראות רוח ונשמה ונפש :** "We find, that the three first, namely, Supreme Crown, Wisdom, and Understanding, are the intellectual numerations ; and called, Spirit, Soul, and Life." But R. Simeon ‡ resembles their union with each other to that of the head, the mind, and the heart. **רישא כתר עליון מוחא**

* Tykune Sohar, Lib. i. Tyk. 38.

† Sepher Liphne Liphanim as cited by Rit. but without other references.

‡ Tykune Sohar, Tyk. 10, fol. 122.

“ חכמה בינה בה לב מבין : ” The head is the representative of the Supreme Crown, the mind of Wisdom ; but Understanding is represented by an understanding heart.” So R. Bechai :*

ראש האד' שהוא כבוד לכל הנוף כננד הכתיר שהוא ראש לכל הספריות וכתיב ראש דברך אמת וכתיב ראשו כחתם פז מוחו וחכו של אדם כננד החכמה שהיא פנימית וכתוב חכו ממתקים וכן במלת חכמה נרמז מוח היך לשונו ננד הבינה שהיא מוציאה כל הכהות לאור הוא שכותב וככלו מchmodים בן הלשון מוציא ומנלה כחות המחשבה וכבר ידעת בקבלה כי הכתיר והחכמה והתשובה הכל דבר א' : The head of the man, which is the glory of the whole body, corresponds with the Crown, which is the head of all the numerations ; and this is what is written, The head of thy word is truth ; and again, His head is the purest gold. The brain and the palate of the man correspond with the interior Wisdom ; and so it is written, His palate is most sweet. Thus by the term, Wisdom, is represented brain, palate. His tongue corresponds with Understanding ; which brings forth all the powers or energies to light. This is what is written ; He is altogether lovely. Thus the tongue brings forth, and makes manifest, the powers of the mind. But you must be already aware,

* Com. Gen. p. 9, col. 2.

“ from the Cabbala ; that the Crown, the Wisdom, “ and the Returning, are all one thing.” So again :* **וְעוֹד שֵׁם אֲהִיה רָמֶז לְתִשׁוּבָה וּנְקַרְאָת** בשם שתי הספירות הקודמות לה לפי שהוא נאצלת מכחם והנה אהיה הראשון בכתו' הוּא התשובה והשני על שתי הספירות הקודמות לה ויהיה פירוי אהיה אשר אהיה המאושר מן אהיה הראשון והכל דבר אחד והשם הזה הוּא **הָעָלִיוֹן שְׁבָכֶל מְדוּתֵיו שֶׁל הַקָּבָה** : “ Moreover, “ the appellation, I AM, represents Returning, “ which is called by the appellation of the two “ numerations preceding it; as it is emanated “ from their energy. Now, it is the former, I AM, “ in the text, that is Returning; but the latter, “ which represents the two numerations anterior “ to it: so that the import of the text, I AM THAT “ I AM, is, I am that which is drawn from the “ first I AM. But the whole are one thing; and “ this is that exalted name, which exists in all the “ attributes of the deity.”

If to this it should be made an objection, that the Cabbalists, by comparing the higher numerations with the head, brain, and heart; or with the spiritual, rational, and vital parts of man; do not thereby regard them as distinct subsistences, but merely as parts of a subsistency; I answer, that the objection is of no force: for though it be

* Com. Ex. iii. 14.

true, that the head, brain, and heart, exist together, as parts of a man ; yet, whenever we discourse of those parts, it is always with the presumption, that they are capable of subsisting singly ; and the reason why the Cabbalists adopt such comparisons, is not that they would deny the actual subsistency of each by itself, but that they may seem to maintain the common sameness of their nature ; and lest the reader should be led to suppose, that the third numeration is not equally divine with the first or second ; or that they do not all subsist alike in the godhead, without any inequality or distinction of substance. Thus argues, indeed, a learned commentator on R. Simeon ben Jochai :*

שאומר כה האור שבספרה זו אינה בספרה זו וככה האור שבספרה
 שבספרה זו אינה בספרה זו ומকץ ומפריש ומחלק בין
 זו אינה בספרה זו ומקץ ומפריש ומחלק בין
 ספרה לספרה הוא חטא חטא נדלה כאלו
 מקץ ומפריש ומחלק בעצמות אחדות אין סוף ברוך
 הוא :

“ He who asserts, that the virtue of the
 “ light, which is in that numeration, is not in this
 “ numeration ; or that the virtue of the light,
 “ which is in this numeration, is not in that numer-
 “ ration ; thus severing, separating, and dividing
 “ between one numeration and another ; commits
 “ a most egregious sin ; inasmuch as he severs,

* Com. on Tykune Sohar, p. 13, as cited by Rit. but without further references.

“separates, and divides the very essence of the “unity of the infinite being, blessed be he.” To corroborate this attestation of the expositor of R. Simeon, we may further add, that the mere supposition of their being emanations of light, is sufficient to prove the identity of their substance; as the light from which they flow, and of which they severally consist, must needs be the same; the only thing difficult of comprehension being, how they can have actually subsisted, in that manner, from all eternity.

The actual subsistency of each from eternity, however, is a point, which is much insisted on by the Cabbalists in general. R. Shabtai * seems by way of anticipation to have stated, at full length, whatever can be urged against the truth of the position; and afterwards replied to it with his ונהן לא די שלא נתוישב הフィロש שפירושנו בעניין החדש ווישנים כי גם הם החדש שנתה חדש כמו אדם הראשון אלא שניתוק קושיא עצימה וחזקת בקבלה אלקיות כי אחרי שהspirות הם עצם אלקיות והאלקיות אינן נופל תחת הוםן אלא ימצא בזמן בלבתי ומן אלא הוא קדמון נצחי בלבתי בעל תכליות והוא המציאות והוויה את הוםן ואמם כן איך יתכן לומר שהאלקיות נאצל שחרוי אצילותו הדושו שאחר אצילות היה וקדם אצילותו לא היה והוא ונשיב לבעל דין כי אצילותן

* Thus quoted by Rittangel; but as before, without any references.

חיא בערך הנבראים לא בערך עצמן כי אצילותן היא
 כדי להתגנות לנבראים כדי שהנבראים מאורן
 ושיזוננהו הנבראים על יdon אבל בערך עצמן היו קודם
 אצילותן יתר שאת יותר עז אור בהיר אור חזק עד
 של גודל חזק אורן לא היה באפשר לנבראים ליהנות
 : “ מזו אורן ולהתגננה על ידי אור הנדול :
 “ observe, it is not sufficient, that we reject
 “ the exposition, which we have been giving, in
 “ the case of new and old ; seeing that the latter
 “ may be called new, in some sense, because they
 “ were once new, though not now, as was, for
 “ instance, the first man ; but we must institute a
 “ very weighty and important objection, which
 “ here offers itself to us, in this divine doctrine of
 “ the Cabbala. For since that the numerations
 “ are the very substance of the deity, and the
 “ deity does not fall under the predicament of
 “ time, but exists in time without time, is primor-
 “ dial, eternal, infinite, and the very cause of ex-
 “ istence to time itself ; how can it be asserted,
 “ that the deity is emanated ; as, doubtless, the
 “ emanation of it must be the creation of it ; for
 “ after the emanation, it should seem, he was ;
 “ but before the emanation, he was not ? To this
 “ we reply, that their emanation was in respect
 “ of the created beings, and not in respect of
 “ themselves ; for their emanation was for the
 “ purpose of manifesting themselves to the crea-

“ tures, in order that these, after being created, “ might enjoy their light, and be directed by “ them. But as to themselves, they existed “ before their emanation in a superiority of excel- “ lence, and in a superiority of strength ; their “ light being so powerful and resplendent, that, “ for its transcendent greatness, it was incom- “ petent to created beings to enjoy its splendor, “ or to be guided by the means of their trans- “ cendent light.” The author then prosecutes the argument still further by observing, that, as it happens in attempting with our naked eyes to look at the meridian sun, we blink, and nearly turn blind, without any possibility of perceiving the object, and that, not by reason of the privation or defect of the solar light, which is then the strongest, but on account of the debility of our vision, which is unable to sustain its meridian brightness ; so also in the emanation of the god- head, the glory or splendor of the numerations, previous to their emanating, was so transcen- dently bright and powerful, that our intellectual sight would have been dazzled and obscured, in trying to apprehend them. That their emanation was only an extension of their light from some- thing, which had the power of emanating, to something which was made to emanate ; and from that which was made to emanate, to some-

thing which was emanated, or had been made to emanate again, according to their several gradations ; in order that they might be, at least in part, apprehended by the creatures, in their remotest splendor. That to deny the subsistency of each antecedent to their emanation, merely on the ground, that we cannot apprehend it; would be as absurd as for bats to contend, that the sun does not exist, but only the moon ; because the weakness of their vision wholly prevents them from seeing the former luminary, whilst it readily permits them to behold the latter.

I know, indeed, of no objection to which this argument, drawn from the doctrine of the Cab-bala, is liable ; except that it makes for the eternal subsistency of the inferior, as well as of the superior numerations. But if we call to mind, that the inferior, as is universally admitted, proceeded or emanated from the superior, and, consequently, are posterior to them, as well in respect of duration, as in point of order : the force of the objection will be considerably diminished. For though we may easily form in our minds an idea of God existing without the seven inferior numerations, that is, without Mercy, Severity, Beauty, Victory, Glory, Stability, and Sovereignty : their necessity being apparent only in the creation, and in the administration of the

world; not to mention, that many of the Jews interpret them of angels; yet we cannot form any notion, whatever, of God existing without the superior numerations, Celestial Crown, Wisdom, and Understanding; which seem essential to the very being of God, and which claim to themselves eternal subsistency, chiefly from this consideration, that they cannot be supposed not to subsist.

CHAPTER X.

To the truly sublime doctrine of the Cabbalists, concerning the ten numerations of the godhead, I may subjoin that of the Daruschists, concerning the seven pre-existences of the world; in which the truth of our trinitarian hypothesis is most eminently displayed. This doctrine of the seven pre-existences, like most other doctrines peculiar to Judaism, has its rise in certain curious and subtle expositions of the sacred text; and is to be found inculcated chiefly in the writings of the Daruschists, who do not, however, universally agree, either in the names, or in the number of the pre-existences. The general opinion is, that they are seven in number; being named by some, The Law, Repentance, The Garden of Eden,

Hell, The Throne of Glory, The Sanctuary, and The Name of the Messias; by others, The Law, The Throne of Glory, The Fathers, Israel, The Name of the Messias, The Sanctuary, and Repentance; but by others, The Garden of Eden, The Law, The Saints, Israel, The Throne of Glory, Jerusalem, and Messias, the Son of David. Sometimes we find only six mentioned, and Repentance added as the seventh, on the authority of R. Abhu bar R. Zeira, the Talmudist. But in every account of them, whether six, or seven, in number; we always have the Law, and the Throne of Glory; and are taught to distinguish between them and the rest, in that these two were caused actually to subsist before the creation of the world; whereas the other five pre-existed but ideally, in the mind of the creator. The subsequent extract, taken from a work of the very highest authority,* will confirm the preceding statements.

ששה דברים קדמו לבריאת העולם
 יש מהם שנבראו ויש מהם שעלו במחשבה
 להבראות התורה וכסא הכבוד נבראו תורה מניין
 שנאמר ה' קניי ראשית דרכו כסא הכבוד מניין
 שנאמר נכוון כסאך מאז וננו' אבות וישראל וב' וה' ושמו
 של מישיח עלו במחשבה להבראות האבות מניין
 שנאמר כענבים במדבר וננו' ישראל מניין שנאמר זכור
 עדתך קנית קדם ב' מה מניין שנאמר כסא כבוד מרים

* Medrash Rabba Par. Berescheth, fol. 1. Amst. ed.

מראשון מקום מקדשנו שמו של מישיח מניין שנאמר
יהו שמו לעולם ונוי רבי אבחו בר רבי זעירא אמר אף
תשובה שנאמר בטרם הרים יולדו מאותה שעה
“ **תשב אנווש עד דכא וננו** :
“ the creation of the world; some of which were
“ actually created, and some only in agitation
“ to be created. The Law and the Throne of
“ Glory were actually created. From what scrip-
“ ture is the Law proved to have been thus cre-
“ ated? From the text: Jehovah possessed me,
“ as the beginning of his way. From what the
“ Throne of Glory? From the words: Thy
“ throne was established before any time, and so
“ forth. The Fathers, Israel, the Sanctuary, and
“ the Name of the Messias, were in contemn-
“ alation to be created. The Fathers, whence
“ proved to have been so? From the text: Like
“ grapes in the desert, and so forth. Israel,
“ whence? From the words: Remember thy
“ congregation, which thou hast possessed from
“ antiquity. The Sanctuary, whence? From the
“ passage: The place of our Sanctuary is a lofty
“ throne of glory, from the beginning. The
“ Name of the Messias, whence? From the
“ words of the Psalmist: His name shall be for
“ ever, and so forth. R. Abhu bar R. Zeira
“ said, Repentance may also be proved, in like
“ manner, from the text: Before the mountains

“ were formed, from that very hour, thou reducest
“ man to destruction, and so forth.”

From the foregoing testimony, it is abundantly manifest, that the Law and the Throne of Glory, by being made to subsist anterior to the creation of the world; ought to be regarded as divine subsistences, corresponding with the numerations, Wisdom, and Understanding; and standing in the same order and relation with the Supreme Being, that Wisdom and Understanding do with the Supreme Crown. The priority, indeed, of the Law to the Throne of Glory, has not always been positively and absolutely declared; though now generally inculcated on the arguments and authority of R. Abba, the Talmudist. Thus we read in Medrash Rabba.*

אבל אין יודע اي זה מהם קודם אם התורה קדמה לכסא הכהן או אם לכסא הכהן קודם תורה אמר רבי אבא בר כהנא תורה קדמה לכסא הכהן שנאמר ה' קני ראותיך דבריו קודם לאותו שבתיכם בו נכוון כסאך מאז:

“ But I know not which of these two was prior;
“ whether the Law was prior to the Throne of
“ Glory, or the Throne of Glory was prior to the
“ Law. R. Abba bar Cohena says; The Law
“ preceded the Throne of Glory, because it is
“ written; Jehovah possessed me, the beginning
“ of his way; prior to that of which it is

* Ibidem.

“ written ; Thy throne was established from “ that time.” The above are, unquestionably, the most ancient testimonies, that can now be produced, of the antemundane existences ; and from these was derived whatever has since been promulgated of the doctrine by modern theologists. But seeing that the actual, and not the potential, pre-existences form the ground of this argument ; it behoves us to restrict our remarks to the former, that is, to the Law and the Throne of Glory ; which are maintained to be spiritual subsistences, and to have emanated in order from the godhead, before the foundation of the world.

Though of these two divine personalities many illustrious things have been said by many expositors ; yet by none have their ineffable essence and transcendent glory been so ably pourtrayed, as by R. Moses Alshech, who, as will appear from the subsequent extracts, has placed the truth of their divinity and personality, but especially those of the Law, beyond the possibility of an assault.*

הנה ארזיל כי זו דברים קדמו לעולם תורה וכסא הכבוד וישראלוביה תשובה ושםו של מישיח כمفוש אצלנו יפה בבר' נס אמרו שם כי התרור' קדמה לכסא הכבוד שנאמר קדם מפעליו מאז קדם לכיה שנאמר בו נכון כסאך מאז והנה יודע כל שער יודע דת ודין כי מבלי הכסא הכבוד לא היה מבוא אל הברא

* Com. Prov. viii. 22.

עולם נשמי מתחלי רוחניות אך נשתלה הוה
 עי' כי בנווע נס ידענו כי האziel רוחניות הוא דרכו
 יתי מתייחס אליו מה שאין כן לפועל עליה נשמית
 אינו רק עי' השתלהות כדבר וויא ית' טרם יברא
 עולם נשמי האziel רוחניות מאותו יתב' הוא את כסא
 כבודו וזה מתייחס אל דרכו ית' ואח'כ' לברא מה
 שהוא נשמי הווע מדרכו הוצרך השתלהות בנווע
 ונבא אל הענן כי הנה אמרה תאמיר התורה הקדושה
 הביטו וראו נס שתראוני אצלכם שחרחות מלובשת
 התנשיות מה אל אקל בעיניכם כי הנה חין ערבי
 גבוח מעל גבוח הוא עד אין חקר כי הלא נס שהוא
 יתברך האziel כסא הבוד להיות על ידה הכתנת
 השתלהות הבריא' אין צורך לומר שלא נבראותי
 עי' כסא הבוד כי אם שאדרבה אני קדמתי אליה
 וו'א ה' קני ראיית לא בראשי' בריא' פועלות עולם
 הנשמי הבלתי מתייחס אל דרכו ית' לברא נשימות
 רק ראשית דרכו כלומר ראשית מה שהוא אzielות
 רוחני אשר הוא דרכו בייחוד קני כי הלא היה קדם
 מפעלו אשר היה מאז הם הו' דברים שפועל קודם
 לעולם שבכלם כסא הבוד עליה נאמ' נכוון כסאך
 מאז והיה ראשית מה שהוא דרכו להziel רוחניות
 כי ביה החל השם הנдол הזה להziel ובכסא הבוד
 כלה שנס היא דרכו כי אzielות רוחנו נמרץ היא
 בנווע : Behold our Rabbies of blessed memory
 " assert, that seven things were anterior to the
 " world ; the Law, the Throne of Glory, Israel,
 " the Garden of Eden, the Sanctuary, Repen-
 " tance, and the name of the Messias ; as is well

“ expounded to us in *Bereshith Rabba*. They
“ also affirm, in the same work, that the Law pre-
“ ceded the Throne of Glory, according to the
“ scripture, Before his works that were prior to
“ time; therefore, before the Throne of Glory,
“ of which it is merely said, Thy Throne was
“ established prior to time. Now no person, that
“ is conversant in the writings of the Jewish
“ Church, can be ignorant, that, without the
“ Throne of Glory, there would have been no
“ proceeding, after the termination of spiritual
“ existences, to the creation of the material
“ world; but that, by means of the Throne of
“ Glory, a being was extended to it, according
“ to the received opinion. Moreover, we know,
“ that that which caused the spiritual natures to
“ emanate, was the Way of the Lord, to whom it
“ refers its extraction; but this was not the case
“ in the production of any thing of bodily sub-
“ stance, that deriving its existence, as hath been
“ already observed, by means of an extension
“ from the Throne of Glory. For the Lord,
“ before that the material world was created,
“ caused to emanate from himself, blessed be he,
“ the spiritual existences; as well he as the
“ Throne of his Glory, which refers its extraction
“ to his Way, blessed be he; but afterwards,
“ extension was left alone, without his Way, to

“ create every thing that is corporeal, according
“ to the received opinion. But to return to the
“ subject. The holy law here says: Look up, and
“ see: though you view me black or unseemly,
“ dressed in a somewhat material form; yet
“ let me not be esteemed vile in your sight; for
“ unquestionably the honor of my rank is exalted
“ above every thing that is exalted, without
“ either bounds or limits. Is it not a fact, that
“ the deity caused to emanate the Throne of Glory,
“ whereby to give an aptitude to the diffusion of
“ the creation? It must, therefore, be needless to
“ assert, that I was not created by the Throne of
“ Glory: on the contrary, I was anterior to it;
“ and this is the sense of the scripture: The Lord
“ possessed me the beginning, not in the begin-
“ ning, of the creation of the material world;
“ it not belonging to his Way to create corporeal
“ existences; but the beginning of his Way, that
“ is, the beginning, whatever it may be, of spiri-
“ tual emanation, which is his Way, he pos-
“ sessed me singly: for, doubtless, before those
“ works of his, which were prior to time, those
“ seven things, which he wrought before the
“ world, in which is included the Throne of Glory,
“ it being said of it, Thy Throne was established
“ prior to time; before those works, I say, there
“ was the beginning, whatever it may be, of his

“ Way, to cause to emanate the spiritual exist-
 “ ences; for by me the illustrious name here
 “ mentioned began to emanate, but finished by
 “ the Throne of Glory; as this last, also, is his
 “ Way, it being, according to the received
 “ opinion, a powerful spiritual emanation.” So
 likewise in another part of the same comment:*

ונבוא אל העין אומרת התורה הביטו וראו תפארת
 נדולתי פן יעלה על רוחכם כי נם כי רוחנית אני
 אהיה כאחד המלאכים המשרתים את פניו מלכו של
 עולם נפרדת ממהותו יתברך ומה נם אחר שחולلت
 כי הלא אני חכמתו יתברך בלתי נפרדת
 ממהותו כי הלא בהכינו שמים על מכוון כדוריותו
 שחש הוא יתברך מלהמציא מלאכים פן יאמרו
 שהיו בעוזרו כאמרנו מיathi שם הויתי אני והוא
 אמר נוטה שמים לבדי ואילו הייתה כאחד מלאכי
 השרת נפרדת מאיכותו איך היה לבדו ולא חש
 על המצא כי אשר על המלאכים אך זה יורה כי אני
 והוא לאחדים נתחשב כי נם שחולلت מוקרי הראשון
 דבק בו באמת זהה בהכינו שמים שם אני בחוקו
 הונ על פני תחום כי הוא יתברך חש פן יאמרו
 שהמלאכים היו אוחזים בקצוות והוא יתברך ממדד
 באמצעתן כמרפו החונן אך אני הייתה בהכינו קצוטוי
 וחוקו החונן למדד ואמיר על פני תחום למה שהויה
 הושך על פני תחום והיה מקום לומר כי להיות
 הוא יתברך רחוק מהחשך כי נהרא עמי שרא היה
 התורה בהתפשטויה פועלת שם שהיתה בלתי

* Com. Prov. viii. 27.

מתיחסת הפעלה אלו יתברך רק אל דבר נפרד
מן לא בן היה רק הוא היה המכין שמים ומחקה
הוּג בעצמו עם הוותי שם אני כי לא אתייחס לנפרדת
“ But to return to the subject ; :
“ The Law saith, that it may not enter into your
“ minds, that I am nothing but a spiritual sub-
“ sistency, like one of the angels which attend the
“ presence of the king of the world, distinct and
“ separate from his individual essence, and espe-
“ cially since I have been begotten ; do behold,
“ and regard the excellency of my majesty ; for I
“ am his Wisdom, blessed be he, and inseparable
“ from his essence. In fixing the heavens on a
“ basis, as an habitation for himself ; because that
“ the deity, blessed be he, scrupled to give exist-
“ ence to the angels, for fear men should say, that
“ they had been in the number of his coadjutors,
“ according to the words of the scripture, Who
“ was with me ? — I only was there present. He
“ saith, moreover, Who stretch out the heavens
“ by myself ; but if I had been as one of the mi-
“ nistering angels, of a different quality from
“ himself, how could he have been alone ? That
“ he did not entertain the same scruples about my
“ subsistency, as he did about that of the angels,
“ is demonstrable from this, that I and he are
“ considered as one. For though I have been
“ produced ; the original womb, from which I

"sprang, is in reality coalescent and closely
 "united with him. This, too, is the sense of the
 "passage, When he prepared the heavens, I was
 "there; when he set a circle on the face of the
 "abyss: for the deity was apprehensive, lest
 "men should say, that the angels had taken hold
 "of the extremities of the world; and that he,
 "superadding as it were the circle, had measured
 "by their means. I only, therefore, was present
 "on his adapting the extremities of it; and
 "setting the circle, to measure withal. But he
 "saith, On the face of the abyss; why? Because
 "darkness was upon the face of the abyss; and
 "because, since the Lord is aloof from darkness,
 "for with him dwelleth the light; and the Law,
 "by its extension, was there the agent; men
 "might have taken occasion to say, that the work
 "was not ascribable to the deity; but to some-
 "thing different from himself. This, however,
 "was not the case. He alone by himself it was,
 "that prepared the heavens, and set the circle;
 "although I was there with him: for I am not to
 "be referred to any essence, different from him-
 "self; by no means." So again: *
 כי הַתּוֹרָה
 אלְהִוָּת הִיא הִתֵּה כְּלֵי אֹמְנוֹתָו יְהִי אֲשֶׁר בָּהּ בָּרָא
 את הַעוֹלָם: For the Law is a divinity. It was
 "the instrument of the workmanship of God,

* Com. Prov. viii. 22.

“ whereby he created the world.” In like manner, on another occasion : * כי הלא ראשו היא התורה ; which is the head of the seven things, that were created before the world ; which is the very head of him, who created it ; and by the instrumentality of which arises all our happiness.” That the Law, then, is a divine personality of the godhead, the above citations from R. Moses Alshech afford competent evidence. (תורת ר' משה אלשיך)

In addition to what has been already affirmed of the Throne of Glory, that it is a mighty spiritual emanation ; the following testimonies from the same author are worthy of being alleged in this place : † ואראה את ה' יושב על כסא הכבוד : ו לא שתצוייר בו יתב' ישיבת כי הלא הכסא רם ונשא רם מן איכות העולם הזה הכלל שמים וארץ ונשא מעולם המלאכי באופן שאין הכסא בעל גבול ואיך אין היישבה במראות ושוליו וככ' לא איש ארוממנחו אסלק השנחתו ית' מעולם השפלה כי הלא ושוליו של כסא הכבוד הוא סרה התפשתו מלאים את היכל של בית המקדש שבארץ הם כנפי השכינה המשתללים ומתלבשים כמשל הישלים : And “ I saw the Lord, sitting on the Throne of Glory :

* Com. Cant. v. 11. † Com. Isaiah, vi. 1.

“ not that the act of sitting can be imagined or delineated in Jehovah; for the Throne is high and elevated; high above the situation of this world, which contains the heavens and the earth; and elevated, in a manner, above the world of the angels; as the Throne is infinite, and therefore literally speaking, there can be no sitting, as described in the vision. And its fringes, and so forth: not because I exalt him so high, do I therefore make the providence of God rise above this lower world; for do not the fringes of the Throne of Glory, that is, the plenteousness of its extension, fill the temple of the sanctuary, which is in the land? These are the wings of the Habitation; which are here made to extend themselves, and to put on a dress, under the metaphor of fringes.” Thus again: ועם כל זה כלם נכללים לא' כי כל ישראל נפש אחת יקראו להיות כל נשמהן משורש אחדות הקדושה מתחת כסא הכבוד שלא היו כן האומרים: “ But notwithstanding this, they are all comprehended as one: for the whole of Israel is termed one soul, seeing that all their souls have issued from the root of the holy unity, from under the Throne of Glory; which is not the case with the Gentile nations.” This opinion of the souls of Israel being cut out from under the

* Com. Cant. vi. 8.

Throne of Glory, and which the author has evidently transcribed from the volumes of the Talmud, is a clear demonstration of the Throne being a spiritual essence; as well as leads to the belief, that, with the ancient Jewish Fathers, it was never regarded as a created being, either of the heavens or the earth; but as a divine emanation, from which every immaterial subsistency, whether angelic or human, has derived its origin; and by the instrumentality of which the very worlds, themselves, were created and perfected.

Indeed, that both the Law and the Throne of Glory were employed as agents in the fabrication of the universe, is the doctrine of the Cabbalists. Thus the author of *Tykune Sohar*: *

וְהִנֵּנוּ בְּרָא אֱלֹהִים בְּאוֹרִיתָא דְאֵינוֹ רָאשִׁית בְּרָא כְּרוּסָא דְאֵינוֹ אֱלֹהִים דְהַכִּי סְלִיק הַכְּסָא לְחוֹשָׁבָן

“ This is the meaning of the text, In : “ the beginning created Elohim : By the Law, “ which is, the Beginning; created the Throne, “ which is, Elohim : for thus the letters of, the “ Throne, amount, by calculation, to those of, “ Elohim.” Hence, Elohim, or God, in the account of the creation, is understood by the Daruschists and Cabbalists, either of the Throne of Glory, or of the Numeration, Understanding;

* Fol. 4, col. 2.

which, as will hereafter appear, denote one and the same subsistency. But, if these antemundane existences actually created the heavens and the earth; they must have been omnipotent spirits, and personalities of the Godhead.

Besides R. Moses Alschech, I know of no writer, who has treated this subject, in all its parts, with so much learning and ingenuity, as R. Moses Ilpeles. I do not, however, accord with him in all his assertions. For amongst other things he lays down, that all the pre-existences, as well actual as ideal, equally originated at the first in the mind of the deity; but that the former, after having been formed in thought, received an actual subsistency; whereas the latter did not. To this unqualified position I cannot, by any means, assent; as it seems to me to be repugnant, not only to the principles of metaphysics, but to the words of the Daruschist, whom he has attempted to explain. It is not affirmed, that the Law and the Throne of Glory existed in idea, or in the mind of the deity, previous to their existing actually; but rather the contrary, that they always existed actually, and never ideally; this being the difference intended to be expressed between them and the rest. Neither can the distinction of the author between actual and ideal existency be maintained, on metaphysical grounds.

For since it is argued by himself, that the two pre-existences in question existed, as well in the act as in the mind of the deity, prior to the conception and formation of the world; and as it is admitted, on all hands, that time did but commence with the creation of the world; there must be a strange absurdity in supposing, that the two subsistences existed, first in the mind of the deity, and afterwards actually; when as yet time itself, and consequently its distinctions of *fore* and *after*, had not begun to exist. If the Law and the Throne of Glory were actually in being before the formation of the world, they must have been so from eternity; for the only conception we can form of any thing subsisting from eternity, is, that, when time commenced, it was actually subsisting.

But though the author has not expressed himself unobjectionably on this point; the reason which he has assigned, why the other pre-existences of the world did not subsist actually, as well as in idea, is worthy of admiration. His opinion is, that God did not actually form them, on account of the Epicureans. For if all those things, which were the final cause of the creation, had actually existed before the world was made; the Epicureans might have denied, that God created the worlds by himself, and have alleged

this as an argument for a plurality of gods. The reasoning of the author, it must be confessed, is highly ingenious; and, so far as it attempts to account for the things not having been actually formed, as soon as conceived, is equally satisfactory. But with respect to the two subsistences, which did actually exist prior to the creation; we cannot reply to the Epicureans, in this manner. They will, on the contrary, have just grounds for concluding, that God did not make the worlds by himself; but had to co-operate with him, both the Law and the Throne of Glory.

This objection Ilpeles certainly foresaw, and has endeavoured to obviate it by demonstrating, that God, the Law, and the Throne of Glory, are all one and the same thing.* ואית ולמה עלו לפועל התורה וכסא הכבוד אני אומר לך הטעם והוא שהיבה והתורה והכסא הכל דיא וכמו שה אמר ברוך ה' אלהים אלהיו ישראל יכול אתה לומ' וברוך שם כבודו שהוא כסא הכבוד וימלא כבודו את כל הארץ שהוא התורה וכמו שנאמר Amen במש' ברוך ה' ניב נאמר במש' וברוך שם כבודו לעולם וויש Amen ואמן Amen לברוך ה' ואמן לברוך שם כבודו לעולם כלו תפלות רוצה לבודו והוא תורה וכסא כבודו ה' ובריאות העולם לבדו והוא תורה וכסא כבודו הכל דבר אחד כלו תפלות דוד בן יש' : But if " you should ask, why the Law and the Throne

* Hoil Mosche, Perek iv. p. 20.

“ of Glory were actually created, but the others
“ not; I will tell you the reason. It is because
“ Jehovah, the Law, and the Throne, are all
“ one and the same thing. For like as you say,
“ Blessed be Jehovah God, the God of Israel;
“ you can say, And blessed be the name of his
“ glory, that is, the Throne of Glory; And all
“ the earth is full of his Glory, that is, of the
“ Law. And as, Amen, is affirmed after the
“ expression, Blessed be Jehovah; so is it affirmed
“ after the phrase, And blessed be the name of
“ his glory for ever; this being what the Psalmist
“ intends by, Amen and Amen; Amen to, Blessed
“ be Jehovah, and Amen to, Blessed be the name
“ of his glory for ever. He then subjoins: The
“ prayers are ended; that is, Since I have de-
“ monstrated to you the existence of Jehovah,
“ and the creation of the world by himself alone;
“ and that he, and his Law, and the Throne of
“ his Glory, are all one and the same thing; the
“ prayers of David, the son of Jesse, are ended.”
But if God, and the Law, and the Throne of
Glory, be one and the same thing; and, if the
same honor and respect be paid to the one, as to
the other; then have we three divine subsistences,
partaking of one common nature or essence; and
as strong an argument for the doctrine of the
trinity, as the Jew can demand. For since, on

the one hand, it must be foreign to the intention of the Daruschist to assert, that these are distinctions without a difference; that the Law is absolutely the Throne of Glory, and the Throne of Glory the Law, or, that Jehovah is both the Law and the Throne of Glory; and as, on the other hand, it is strenuously maintained by our author, that they are all one and the same thing; it remains for us to conclude, that they are really the same, in respect of their divine nature or substance; and that the only difference, which obtains between them, is that of personality or subsistency.

CHAPTER XI.

BUT besides the metaphysical or numerical distinctions of the Cabbalists, and the actual pre-existences of the Daruschists; the three personalities of the godhead stand expressly designated in the very highest authorities of the Jewish church, the Targumists; from whom, with little or no variation of the names appropriated to them, they found their way among the professors of christianity. The first person they denominate simply, *Jehovah*, or *God*; that being to him, what the term, *Adam*, was to the first of mankind, both a proper and a common appellation.

The second person they call, the *Word of God*, or, the *Word of Jehovah*; and the third, the *Habitation of God*, or, the *Habitation of Jehovah*.

It may justly be disputed, perhaps, how the Targumists were originally led to designate the two latter persons by the names of, Word, and, Habitation; but to me the truth of the matter appears to be this. Perceiving in the Mosaic account of the creation, as also in the writings of the prophets, that whenever God said: Let any thing be; it instantly was, without the aid or instrumentality of secondary causes; they naturally inferred from his *Word* being always self-sufficient for the accomplishment of his will, that it must be something widely different in its properties from that of man, who, whatever his authority may be in the world, can effect nothing by the word of his mouth, without the actual help and co-operation of others. Hence they were led to contemplate the *divine Word*, not as an accident, for that would have been inconsistent with what is expressly declared of it; but as a real personality, which, in the formation of the world, sustained the character of an agent, and superseded the necessity of all secondary causes. But the *Habitation of Jehovah* they so denominated, no doubt, from God being known to dwell in

certain parts of the world, rather than in others; but especially, in the highest heavens, in the land of Judea, in the Sanctuary between the cherubim, and in the minds of his saints: so that whilst, as a divinity, he is omnipresent; as an inhabitant of the world, he must be local and fixed. The Habitation of Jehovah, therefore, differs from both the other subsistences; in that he is an abiding spirit, manifesting to the world his power and glory, by miraculous effects and supernatural appearances.

That both the Word and the Habitation are divine, and not created, at least not according to the vulgar acceptation of the term, created; that they are real personalities, and not accidents of the Supreme Being; nor yet circumlocutory modes of expression for God himself; require the fullest possible demonstration, since it is an argument that has been much controverted, and to the admission of which it is difficult to say, whether certain Jews or Christians have shewn greater hostility. I shall endeavour, therefore, in treating this part of the subject, to remove every shadow of objection to the truth of these positions; and to demonstrate the evidence, on which this argument, drawn from the language of the Targumists, is capable of being established.

First of all, then, I would observe, that it seems impossible to furnish stronger proofs of the divine nature of any being than, that he created the world, and the noblest things in it; that he is constituted as the God of all true worshipers; nor yet of his personality than, that he is distinguished from other individuals by a proper name of his own; that he is endued with voice, speech, anger, compassion, the power of decreeing events, hands, and the word of prophecy; that he is invoked by his votaries, builds, guards, talks, leads, turns from wrath, multiplies the human species, delights, rejoices, and confers blessings on the deserving. But all these attributes the Targumists predicate of the Word, as will instantly appear.*

לילה קדמאה כד אתנלי מירא די על עולם למברא ותיה הוות עולם תהי ובחוי וחשוכה פריס על אפי תהומא ומירא די הוות נהיר ומנהר וקרו ותיה לילא קדמיא :

“The first night was, when the Word of Jehovah appeared to the world to create it. The world was a chaos, and darkness was spread over the face of the abyss; whilst the Word of Jehovah was splendid and luminous. This is called the first night.”

‡ ובסימריה אתעביד עולם “And by his Word was the world created.”

* Jerusalem Targumist, Ex. c. xii. v. 42.

† Onkelos, Deut. xxxiii. v. 27.

* וברא מימרא די ית אדם בדמותה בדמות
 מון קדם יי ברא יתיה דבר זוניה ברא יתהון :
 " And the Word of Jehovah created Adam, in
 " his own likeness ; in a likeness from God, cre-
 " ated he him ; man and wife created he them."
 † וברא מימרא די אלhim לאדם ואמר ליה הא
 עלמא דברית גלי קדמי השוכא ונהורא גליאו
 קדמי ואיך את סבר דלית גלי קדמי אהרא דעת
 " And the Word of Jehovah God called
 " out to Adam, and said to him : Behold the
 " world, which I have created, is naked before
 " me ; light and darkness are manifest to me :
 " how, then, canst thou suppose, that the place,
 " wherein thou now art, is not equally naked
 " before me ? ??"
 ‡ ואותגלי בימיRNA יי על אברהם
 על יצחק ועל יעקב באלהא דשמייא ושום מימרא
 די לא אודעתה להון :
 " And Jehovah by his :
 " Word was manifested to Abraham, to Isaac,
 " and to Jacob, by the God of heaven ; but the
 " name of the Word of Jehovah I did not make
 " known to them."
 § אין מימרא די לא יבנוי
 קרתא מן לען ארדכלוי ביה אין מימרא די
 לא נטיר קרתא דירושלם מן אהער נטיר :
 " Unless the Word of Jehovah shall build the
 " city, the architects of it will labour in vain ;
 " unless the Word of Jehovah shall guard the

* Jerusalem Targ. Gen. c. i. v. 27. † Ib. Gen. c. iii. v. 9.

‡ Ib. Ex. c. vi. v. 3. § R. Jose, Psalm cxxvii. v. 1

“ city of Jerusalem, the centinel will keep watch
 “ in vain.” * וְשָׁמַע יְתִי קָל מִימָּרָא דַי אֱלֹהִים :
 “ And they heard
 “ the voice of the Word of Jehovah God walk-
 “ ing in the garden, at the close of the day.” † וְאָסֹוף מִימָּרָא דַי לְמַלְלָא עַמִּי עַד לִמְיָר
 “ But the Word of Jehovah continued to speak
 “ with me further, saying.” ‡ וְדָבַר מִימָּרָא דַי :
 “ And יְתִי עַמָּא אָוֹרָה מִדְבָּרָא דִימָא דְסֻפָּה : the Word of Jehovah led the people along
 “ the desart of the Red Sea. § וְאָמַר מִימָּרָא דַי
 לְמַשָּׁה עַד אִמְתָּת אֶת קָאִים וּמְצַלִּי קְדֻמִּי שְׁמִיעָא
 הִיא צְלָוָתְךָ קְדֻמִּי בְּרָם צְלָוָתְהוּ דָעַמִּי קְדֻמִּי
 קְרָמָת לְדִידָךְ : “ And the Word of Jehovah : said to Moses : How long wilt thou stand and
 “ pray before me? thy prayer is heard in my
 “ presence, though the prayer of my people
 || וְאָמַר חֹזֶר כַּעַן מִימָּרָא דַי
 מִן תְּקוּפָה רָנוֹנָה וְתוֹב עַלְן בְּרָחְמָךְ טְבִיא וּבְרִיךְ
 רְבּוֹתָא וְאַסְנִיא אַלְפִיא דְבָנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל : “ And he said : Turn, I pray, O Word of Jehovah,
 “ from thy powerful indignation ; and return to
 “ us with thy exuberant kindness ; bless the
 “ myriads, and augment the thousands of the
 ¶ וּמִיתָּתְמָן מִשָּׁה עַבְדָא דַי .” children of Israel.

* Onkelos, Gen. c. iii. v. 8. † Jonathan, Isaiah, c. viii. v. 5.

‡ Jerusalem Targ, Ex. c. xiii. v. 17. § Ib. Ex. c. xiv. v. 15.

|| Ib. Num. c. x. v. 36.

¶ Ib. Deut. c. xxxiv. v. 5.

בָּאָרֶעָהָן דָּמוֹאָבָי עַל פָּום נְזִירָת מִימְרָא דַיִּי :
 “ And there died Moses, the servant of Jehovah,
 “ in the country of the Moabites ; according to
 “ the tenor of the decree of the Word of Je-
 “ *ית מִימְרָא דַיִּי אַמְלִיכָתָן עַלְיכָוּן וּמָה .”
 : “ The Word of Je-
 “ hovah you have this day constituted over you,
 “ + בְּכָן שִׁזְבְּתָוּן יְתָ בְּנֵי ”
 : “ to become your God.” “ יִשְׂרָאֵל מִיד מִימְרָא דַיִּי :
 “ ye rescued the children of Israel from the hand
 “ of the Word of Jehovah.” “ בֵּיהַ מִימְרָי :
 : “ בְּחִירִי דָאַתְרָעָשׁ ”
 : “ My chosen, in whom my Word
 “ §וַיְהִי מִימְרָי עַלְיהָן לְאִוְתָבָא לְהָן : ”
 “ And my Word shall rejoice over them, to do
 “ them good.” “ And
 “ thou shalt receive a word from my Word.”
 ¶ כּוֹתִיהַ דְמָקְנִי לְיהָ לְמַעְבָּד טָבָא כּוֹתִיהַ מִימְרָא
 דְשָׁמְיָא וּוְטָבָלְיהַ וְדְמָקְנִי לְיהָ לְבִשָּׁמָעַד כְּבִישָׁתָה
 מִימְרָא לְשָׁמְיָא יְבָאֵשׁ לְיהָ : ”
 “ In proportion as :
 “ a man disposes himself to do good, in the
 “ same proportion will the Word of heaven do
 “ good to him ; and as he disposes himself to do
 “ evil, so according to his evil will the Word of
 “ heaven cause evil to him.” Let the foregoing

* Jerusalem Targumist, Deut. c. xxvi. v. 17.

† Jonathan, Joshua, c. xxii. v. 31. ‡ Ib. Isaiah, c. xlvi. v. 1.

§ Ib. Jer. c. xxxii. v. 41.

|| Ib. Ezek. c. iii. v. 17.

¶ Targ. Eccl. c. iv. v. 4.

examples be deemed sufficient for the confirmation of the divinity and personality of the Word. I should not, indeed, have produced so many, but for the sake of the Jewish reader ; who will with difficulty, perhaps, be brought to confess, that there is any thing extraordinary in the use of the term, Word, as applied to Jehovah by the Targumists, unless convinced by the number and force of their testimonies.

If, however, he will take the trouble of seriously and impartially examining the alleged authorities, he will find sufficient reason for believing, not only that it is a personal designation, but that its import is wholly foreign to the common acceptation of the term, word, and bears no manner of relation, whatever, to the faculty of speech. For to say nothing of its leading the Israelites through the desart, of its hearing the prayers of Moses, of its turning from anger to pity, and increasing the numbers of the children of Israel; to say nothing of its being crowned by the Jewish nation for their king and god, of its delighting in a person, and rejoicing to do him good ; of its imparting a word of prophecy, and remunerating the actions of mankind according to their merits ; to say nothing, I exclaim, of these actions here attributed to it being wholly unconnected with the

power of speech, how shall we make it the creator of the universe, and at the same time hearken to the supposition, that it signifies nothing but a word of mouth in the ordinary acceptation of that term? True it is, that with sovereigns possessed of ministers and attendants, the word of command is all that is necessary often for the accomplishment of an action; but before the creation of the world, there was no ministering spirit or angel, to whom such command could have been given; and to contend, that God commanded himself on the occasion, or that he uttered a soliloquy, which fabricated the worlds, would be to reason on the subject with the most consummate folly. I know, that the Law expresses itself always in the language of mankind, and that terms transferred from human speech are but metaphors or translations, when applied to the deity; but with all due deference to that principle of interpretation, I deny the possibility of proving the Word of the Targumists to be either an accident or a quality, or any other thing than a personality of the godhead.

The argument is not at all invalidated by the consideration, that it is mostly in regimen with, Jehovah, or takes its pronominal suffix; for had either, **וְ**, or **וּ**, that is, *Son*, been

used instead of it, such constant and uniform construction would have been equally necessary. The Targumist of the Psalms, however, has employed it actually divested of both regimen and suffix ; and so plainly authorised the manner in which it is used by St. John, in the opening of his gospel. I would further remark, too, that, מיםָר, *Memar*, is never put for, דבר, *Dabar*, meaning a word of prophecy ; nor yet for, מלאך, *Angel* ; as the former is invariably rendered by, פתגָם, *Pithgam* ; and the latter by, מלאך, *Maleach*, as often as they occur in the original Hebrew. This I consider as no mean argument of the eminent signification affixed to it by the Targumists ; for had they intended to convey by the term no higher meaning than either a mandate from God, or a messenger charged with such mandate, it would be difficult to divine the reason, why they should have neglected to employ it on those special occasions.

Indeed, to a number of our most learned theologists, the divinity and personality of the Word have appeared in so convincing a light, that they have gone into the opposite error, asserting, that the Word of Jehovah is but an elegant periphrasis for Jehovah himself, like the strength of Hercules, instead of Hercules ; the body of Agamemnon, instead of

Agamemnon ; the backs of oxen, instead of oxen ; and similar phrases: or, that it is an idiom in the Chaldaic, as it is in the Romaic dialect, and is applied to men as well as to the deity. This, however, is a most unfounded suspicion. In the language of the Targumin it cannot be so much as pretended, that any of those rhetorical circumlocutions are ever used. But had the case been otherwise, and the Targumists had really been inclined to express the divinity by an elegant periphrasis ; it is highly improbable, that they would have selected for that purpose the term, word, which implies nothing essential to the grandeur of any being ; but rather, majesty, glory, wisdom, power, or strength ; which, by being placed in construction with Jehovah, or God, might have formed a periphrasis not unworthy of the deity. The circumlocutory designation of a person is never employed in the invocation of that person, unless accompanied with a pronominal adjunct ; nor even then so as to admit of a verb agreeing with it in any other person than the third, either singular or plural : whereas the Word of Jehovah is not only invoked, but followed, as we see, by verbs of the second person singular, which proves irrefragably, that it is the Word, and not the Jehovah with which it is in regimen,

that is the object of the invocation. It is not put for the Jehovah, or God, of the inspired penmen, indiscriminately; but employed chiefly in the narration or prediction of those performances, of which both the author and the agent are expressly defined. But what I regard as the death blow of the opinion is, that the Word is found to stand by itself, absolutely; without the accompaniment of either Jehovah or the suffix, as in the Targum of the thirty-seventh psalm.

מִתּוֹל דְמַתְבְּרִין בְמִימְרָא יְרֵחָן אָרְעָא
 וּדְמַתְלְטִין בְמָותָא יְשִׁתְיָצָן :

“For they who :
 “are blessed by the Word, shall inherit the
 “earth; but they who are cursed by death, shall
 “be annihilated.” So also in that of the forty-
 fourth psalm.—**בְמִימְרָא מַעֲקִינָא נָנָח**—“By
 “the Word shall we vanquish our enemies.”
 This use of the term completely destroys the
 supposed periphrasis, and shews, if any thing
 can, that the Word is a something subsisting of
 itself, and forms no part whatever of the per-
 sonality of Jehovah.

To strengthen the argument, however, still
 more, I will produce a variety of examples, in
 which a marked distinction may be observed
 between Jehovah and his Word.

* **וּמִימְרָא דֵי** **הָוֶה מַתִּיתְךָ עַל עַמָּךְ דָּסְדָּם וְעַמְוָרָה מַטְרִין דְּרֻעָא**

* Jerusalem Targum. Gen. c. xix. v. 24.

דָלְמָא דַיְעַבְדוּן תְּהוֹבָא מִן עֲוֹבְדֵיהֶן בִּישְׁיא וְכַיּוֹן
 דְחַמְּנִין מְטָרָא דְרֹעָא הָוּ אַמְרָין דְלָמָא דְלִית
 עֲוֹבְרָנָא בִּישְׁיא גַּלְן קְדָמָוְהִי חֹזֶר לְמַהְוִי מַחְיָה
 עַלְיָהָוּ נְוֹפְרִיתָא וְאַשְׁתָּא מִן קְדָם יְיָ מִן שְׁמַיָּא :

“ And the Word of Jehovah poured down upon
 “ the people of Sodom and Gomorrah gracious
 “ rains, to induce them to repent of their
 “ wicked works. But when on seeing the
 “ gracious rain, they said; it is because our
 “ wicked works are not manifest in his sight;
 “ he then began to pour down upon them fire
 “ and brimstone from Jehovah from heaven.”

* מְשֶׁה יַפְקֵד מִן נָוָם מִדְבָּרָא וּמִלְכָא מִשְׁיחָא מִן נָוָם
 רֹומָא דִין יְדָבֵר בְּרִישׁ עַנְנָא וְדִין יְדָבֵר בְּרִישׁ
 עַנְנָא וּמִימְרָא דִי מִדְבָּר בֵּין תְּרוּהָוּן ;
 “ shall come out of the desert, and the king
 “ Messias out of Rome. This shall march at
 “ the head of a cloud, and that shall march at
 “ the head of a cloud; and the Word of Je-
 “ hovah shall march between them.”

† וַיַּעַל דְּבַרְתָּה יְהוָה אֶרְחָם וְאֶפְרָקְנוּן בְּמִימְרָא דִי אֱלֹהָהָוּן וְלֹא
 יַתְפְּרָקְוּן בְּקַשְׁתָּא וּבְחַרְבָּא וּבְעַבְדִּי קְרָבָא בְּסָסּוֹן
 וּבְפְרָשִׁין : But on the house of Judah I will
 “ have mercy, and will redeem them by the
 “ Word of Jehovah, their God; and they shall
 “ not be redeemed by the bow, nor by the sword,

* Jerusalem Targumist, Ex. c. xii. v. 42.

† Jonathan, Hosea, c. i. v. 7.

“ nor by an army; neither by horses, nor by
 * **וְאַنְתָּא אֱלֹהָא בְּמִימְרָךְ תֹּחִית יְתָהּוֹן**.”
 But thou, O God, by thy Word
 “ shalt cast them down to the deepest hell.”
 † **וְלֹבְהָוּן שְׁוֹיאָו תְּקִיף בְּשִׁמְרוֹא מְלֻקְבָּלָא אֲוֹרִיתָא**
 וַיְתַּפְתְּנִמְיָא דֵי שְׁלָחָה יְיָ צְבָאָות בְּמִימְרָה בְּיַד
נְבִיאָ קְדָמָאִי: Their heart they rendered as
 “ hard as adamant; so as neither to receive the
 “ law, nor the words which Jehovah of hosts
 “ had sent by his Word, by means of the
 “ ancient prophets.”
 ‡ **וְדַמְשָׁדָר מִימְרָה לְאַרְעָא**
 “ Who sendeth his Word upon the earth.”
 ¶ **וְוֹשֵׁר מִימְרָה הַזְּנִירָוֹן**: And sent his Word
 || **וְכַעַן יְיָ אֱלֹהִים שְׁלָחָנִי וְמִימְרָה**: like arrows.
 “ And now Jehovah God hath sent me and his
 ¶ **וְבָרָם אָנָּא אֲצִילָה בְּשָׁמָא דֵי וַיְשַׁלַּח** “ Word.
 “ But I will intreat the name of Je-
 “ hovah, and he will send his Word.”
 מִימְרָ מִן קְדָם יְיָ לֹת אַבִימְלָךְ בְּחִלְמָא דְלִילָא
 “ And the Word came from Je-
 “ hovah to Abimelech, in a dream of the night;
 † **וְעַרְעָ מִימְרָ מִן קְדָם יְיָ** “ and said to him.”
 ¶ **לְבָלָעָם וְשָׁוֵי פְתַנְמָא בְּפּוּמָה וְאָמָר**: And the
 “ Word from Jehovah met Balaam, and put

* R. Jose, Ps. lv. y. 25.

† Jonathan, Zech. c. vii. v. 12.

‡ R. Jose, Ps. cxlvii. v. 15.

§ Ib. Ps. xviii. v. 15.

|| Jonathan, Is. c. xlvi. v. 16.

¶ Ib. 1 Kings, c. xviii. v. 42.

** Onkelos, Gen. c. xx. v. 3.

†† Ib. Num. c. xxiii. v. 20.

“**וְהִיא לִיתְהָוָא**”* the word in his mouth, and said. “**אָרוּם אָתַנְנֵד בְּמִימָר מִן קָדָם**”† And behold he : was not ; for he was taken up by the Word from Jehovah. “**חִוְתְּקָפֶד מִימָר מִן קָדָם**” : Is the Word from Jehovah curtailed ?”

For the better conviction of the reader, that each of these instances makes wholly for the present argument, and is exactly in point ; it may not be absurd to remark, that, with respect to the first of them, we find the Targumist evidently distinguishing between the Jehovah, who, according to the inspired penman, poured down upon the devoted townsmen of righteous Lot, fire and sulphur ; and the Jehovah, mentioned towards the clause of the verse, from whom this combustible matter descended out of heaven ; seeing that the former is regarded in the character of an agent or minister, and paraphrased, the Word of Jehovah ; whereas the latter is rendered simply by, Jehovah, and is represented as being still in heaven ; whilst the Word was wielding terror and destruction round Sodom and Gomorrah. It is not to be dissembled, however, that, in commenting on this text, both Jarchi and Aben Ezra consider the latter Jehovah, as an elegant repetition of the noun instead of the pronoun ; and of which they furnish, indeed, a few seeming examples : but, that the Pa-

* Jerusalem Targ. Gen. c. v. v. 24. † Jonathan, Micah, c. ii. v. 7.

raphrast understood it differently, is manifest from the distinction, which he has drawn between them; and, that the former must needs be meant of a person in reality different from the latter, was the opinion not only of R. Menasseh ben Israel, but of many other divines of the highest authority in the Jewish church, as the words of R. Menasseh* will abundantly testify. *Hinc quoque explicantur verba illa : Et Dominus demisit pluviam sulphuris a Domino cœlorum : alioqui locus is satis arduus est. Quamvis autem Aben Ezra schematicam locutionem esse existimet, melius tamen R. Helbo, ex sententia R. Simonis putabat, per primum nomen Domini designari angelum Gabriælem ; ut legatus usurpet nomen ejus a quo missus et potentia donatus erat, ad consummanda destinata. Ideoque ait, demisit (tanquam causa instrumentalis) pluviam sulfuris et ignis a Domino cœli, prima causa, et proximo agente.* “ Hence “ too are explained the words : And the Lord “ rained down sulphur from the Lord of heaven ; “ the place being otherwise rather difficult of in- “ terpretation. For though Aben Ezra looks “ upon the expression as figurative, R. Joseph “ Albo, with much more reason, imagined, ac- “ cording to the opinion of R. Simeon, that, by “ the first name of the Lord, was meant the angel,

* Concil. Quæst. xliv. p. 67.

“ Gabriel; having the name of him by whom he
“ had been sent, and endued with power to con-
“ summate the design. The scripture, therefore,
“ says; Jehovah, that is, the instrumental cause
“ as it were, rained down fire and sulphur from
“ the Lord of heaven, who was the primary cause
“ and proximate agent.”

In the selected case that follows next in order, though the words contain no exposition of any part of scripture, so as to afford an opportunity of collecting their sense from the sacred text; yet will no Jewish reader be disposed to argue, that the Word of Jehovah, stationed between Moses and the Messias, can signify any thing else than a legate from heaven, appointed to attend and conduct them in their march.

The third instance from Jonathan, on the prophet Hosea, is equally free from any solid objection. For if the Word of Jehovah convey to the mind no other idea, than that which is already expressed by the term, Jehovah; nor mean any other person than that, which is the chief subject of the sentence; why is it appended as the instrument of action, and contrasted with the military means of acquiring emancipation; seeing that no person can be at the same time the agent of an action, of which he is declared to be only the instrument? It is true, that, in maintaining the con-

vertibility of the terms, the Christian theologist may insist, that, when Jehovah says, I will deliver the kingdom of Judah, by Jehovah, or by the Word of Jehovah, their God, all that is meant by the expression in either case is, that he will deliver them by himself, agreeably to what has been observed of this form of speech on another occasion : but to the Jewish divine, who lays it down as a certain and infallible position, that Jehovah performs no work with his own hands, but only by his legates or ministering spirits ; it is by no means competent to argue in that manner. So far, indeed, are both Aben Ezra* and Kimchi† from confounding, in this prophecy, the agent with the instrument ; that they expound the latter of the angel that was sent from God against the camp of Senacherib.

In the fourth, the same reasoning will obtain as in the third ; that a palpable distinction is here made between Jehovah, the author of the wicked being cast into hell ; and the Word of Jehovah, the agent or instrument, by whom the punishment is to be inflicted. This is perfectly clear in the present case ; for in the original Hebrew, there is nothing of which the Word, in the Targum, can be considered as a translation ; and to render it reciprocally, as if the Targumist had intended to

* Com. in loc.

† Ibid.

say: Thou, O Jehovah, by thyself shalt cast them into the deepest hell; would be charging him with the use of an emphasis, equally ridiculous and absurd.

The fifth is entitled to particular attention. By his Word, in this Targum, is put for, By his Spirit, in the Hebrew; and that it could not be the individual subsisting spirit of Jehovah himself is demonstrable from the circumstance, that it was sent by him charged with mandates for the people by the hands of the prophets. R. David Kimchi* has expounded the term spirit, in this place, by, the spirit of prophecy.—**ברוחו נבואה שהיתה**—**מדברת עם הנביאים**: “By his spirit, that is, : “ by the spirit of prophecy, which discoursed with “ the prophets.” Here we evidently have the opinion of the author, that this spirit was a divine subsistency, distinct from the person of Jehovah, and was the speaker sent from God, not the thing spoken or imparted to the prophets. Let it not, however, be supposed, that the Targumist here means by the term, Word, the spirit of prophecy; as his constant practice of expressing the prophetic spirit by the phrase, **רוח נבואה**, puts the matter out of doubt. The only reason for citing Kimchi was to shew, that the term, Word, in the Targum, to come up to the sense of the original, can mean

* Com. in loc.

neither Jehovah personally, nor the word of his mouth ; the very sum of the argument which I am endeavouring to establish. Indeed, that it cannot signify the word of his mouth, is evinced in that he is here said to have sent words by this Word ; and that it cannot be understood of himself individually, is equally evident from the senseless jargon consequent on the supposition, that the Targumist meant to say : *The words which Jehovah sent by himself.*

The sixth and seventh instances no less distinguish between Jehovah and his Word, in making the latter to have been sent by the former ; it being utterly impossible that two names, standing in any sentence in this relation to each other, should be understood of one and the same person. The Hebrew term, corresponding to the *Word* of the Targumist, is, in the one case, *Speech* ; and, in the other, *Arrows* : where it is worthy of remark, that, for the latter, he has not deemed *Word* a rendering sufficiently literal, but has added, *as it were arrows* ; insinuating, no doubt, that the language of the Psalmist is here highly figurative, and that the Word of Jehovah, like the arrows of a warrior, can strike terror and dismay into the hearts of his enemies.

The eighth is of a similar complexion with the fifth ; *his Word*, being the targum for, *his Spirit*,

and having the joint authorities of Aben Ezra and David Kimchi for its being a person of itself, in that they both render, *his spirit*, by, *his angel*.

The ninth derives no elucidation from a comparison with the Hebrew; as it seems an illustration, and not a translation, of the sacred text. It fulfils, however, the purpose for which it is here adduced equally with the preceding.

The two next examples present themselves in the most convincing shape. Here we find the Word **דָּבָר יְהוָה**, *from, not, of, Jehovah*; coming to Abimelech and Balaam; admonishing the former in a dream by night, and putting into the mouth of the latter that word of prophecy, which he was to declare unto Balak. In the Hebrew it is, *Elohim*, on both occasions; and of how general an import that term is, the reader does not now surely need to be informed. R. Abraham, in the case of Abimelech, has expounded it of an angel; and, though the Paraphrast has not lowered its signification to that degree, there can be no doubt of his intention to convey something more definite by the expression, the Word from Jehovah, than it was possible for him to do by the term, *Lord, or God only*, as it stands in the Hebrew.

The twelfth and thirteenth, as they follow in order, have the same grounds of recommendation

with the two last mentioned. In each of them we find the Word represented as a divine agent, and that, **מֹתֵךְ יְהוָה**, *from, Jehovah*; a circumstance to which I would have the reader particularly to advert; because, whenever two nouns are connected in this manner, they must of necessity be different and distinct subsistences.

It cannot now be denied, I think, that, from the instances adduced, I have completely demonstrated the construction in question to be no periphrasis for the Supreme Being; and, that we are fully justified in discriminating between the personality of Jehovah, and that of his Word. Indeed, if the Targumists had not actually intended to make this distinction, they would have proved themselves the most frivolous of interpreters, in using words without meaning; as the Jewish commentators in general, to throw more light on the text, and to render the sense of it less embarrassing to the reader, frequently explain the term, Jehovah, by, the angel of Jehovah; which the Targumists seldom or never do, and therefore give us reason to conclude, that their adoption of the phrase, the Word of Jehovah, was with the design of illustrating, as well as translating the original. This certainly agrees with what **R. Nathan ben Jechiel*** has recorded of the style

* Sepher Aruch, Aruch Targem, p. 165.

and use of the Targumin, on the authority of the Fathers. **המתרגם פ██ק כצורתו הרוי זה** בדאי פירוש כננו ויראו את אלהי ישראל וחוו אלהא דישראל הרוי זה בדאי שאין הקדש ברוחו הוא נראה והמוסף עליו וმתרגם וחוו ית מלאכא דאליהא דישראל הרוי זה מהרף ומגדר שעשוה הכבוד מלאך אלא יתרגם וחוו ית יקר אלהא **“ He who paraphrases the scripture, :** **“ according to the letter of it, makes himself a** **“ liar. For instance, should he paraphrase the** **“ text, And they saw the God of Israel, by,** **“ And they saw the God of Israel; this would** **“ be making himself a liar, because the deity,** **“ blessed be he, cannot be seen: and should he** **“ add to it, and paraphrase it, And they saw** **“ the angel of the God of Israel; he would be** **“ a reviler and a blasphemer, in asserting the** **“ glory to be an angel: but he must paraphrase** **“ it, And they saw the glory of the God of Israel.”** Now if this be the principle, on which the Chaldee Paraphrasts always went, in translating the scripture; and, if Onkelos, in a certain text, has rendered the term, God, by, the glory of God, because neither, God, alone; nor, the angel of God, would have given the sense of the original; we have fair grounds for concluding, that as often as they have paraphrased, Jehovah, or, God, by, the Word of Jehovah, or, the Word

of God, they intended to express something different from Jehovah or God himself, considered as a divine person or subsistency of the godhead.

To the preceding considerations I beg to subjoin, that for the feet, the eyes, the face; the tongue, the mouth, the hand, the palm, the arm, the might, the sceptre, the zeal, the desire, the speech, the breath, the commandments, the heart, and the soul, of Jehovah, in the sacred text; we have in the Targumin,* for the most part, the Word of Jehovah; which evinces beyond a doubt, that they had formed in their minds a distinct and adequate conception of its divinity and personality; seeing that no member of the body is the body itself, but may be severed and separated from it without destroying its subsistency. Besides, on the supposition that they meant by it only a certain accident of the divinity; no substantial reason can be assigned, why they should have comprehended under it so many other accidents or properties of a different complexion; for what affinity have either the hands, the eyes, or the feet, with speech, that they should be thought equivalent, in the deity, to the word of his mouth?

* Vid. Targumin of Isaiah i. 20; xxx. 27, 28; xxxvii. 32; xlvi. 13; Jer. xv. 17; xxxii. 31; Hos. x. 10; Joel ii. 11; Mic. vii. 14; Hab. iii. 4; Ps. cvii. 11; Job xxxiii. 4; Ex. xxxiii. 22; Ps. xviii. 24; &c. &c.

The great R. Moses ben Maimon, so far from confounding the Word of Jehovah with Jehovah himself, and, under the colour of a periphrasis, describing them as synonymous expressions ; makes them correlatives, asserting that the former is something created, and is used by Onkelos as the targum of, Jehovah ; not indiscriminately, and without any regard to the nature of the verb of which it is the subject ; but when something is announced as having been achieved by the particular order or word of God, who being so august and powerful a sovereign, may well be thought to put his designs into execution, not with his own proper hands, but by the hands of his angels or ministers, according to his will and express direction. But how R. Moses, or any other theologist, can discover in the major part of the examples selected in this argument, not to mention others that might yet be produced ; the least shadow of a command or order, so as to establish his position, I am at a loss to know, and may despair of instruction. Neither can I subscribe to his opinion, that the construction of this, and similar phrases, by the Targumists, was for the purpose of removing corporeity from the godhead ; because it often occurs, where nothing of the kind was to be apprehended, and is very generally omitted in cases, where, had

that been the design of the expression, it ought certainly to have been used. The remarks of the author, indeed, are restricted in a great measure to Onkelos on the Law, and, therefore, may not have been meant, perhaps, to be extended to the rest of the Targumists. It will evidently appear, however, from what has been already stated, that the Word of Jehovah was, in the opinion of Maimonides, something widely different in subsistency from Jehovah himself, and formed no part, whatever, of his personal divinity.

But though this notion of Maimonides, that the design of Onkelos, in forming the periphrasis, the Word of Jehovah, was purely to keep out of mind the idea of corporeity in the godhead, can never obtain the sanction of a scholar, who will fairly sit down, and diligently weigh all the texts, in which the expression occurs; yet as it tends to overthrow the grounds of this argument, and has even been somewhat applauded for its ingenuity by one of the greatest Hebraicians* that christendom ever produced, it cannot be deemed unnecessary to obviate the force of such respectable authority, and to prove from a writer of equal celebrity with himself, that his remarks, on the style of this paraphrast, are founded in error;

* Hackspan, vid. Tract. de Usu, &c. p. 403.

and that the hypothesis, on which he goes, is incompetent to the solution of the periphrasis in question. Hear the reply of R. Moses Nachmanides.*

וכותב הרב בספר כי בחלק הראשון במורה נידות. ר' משה נחמןides. בזאת נס עלה אני איחר עמד ואני אסקינך ונפלא הרב בזאת על דעת אנקלוי ואמי כי אנקלום שם כל מאודו להרחיק הנשמי בכל ספר אשר בתורה וכל אשר ימצא מalgo השמות המורדים על מן ממיינ הטענה ישים עניין הטענה על כבוד נברא או לשמרה מהאל ומתרג' וירד יי' ואיתגלי יי' ארדה נא וארא איתגלי בען ואיחז' ואם כן למה תרני' כאן אני איחז' ופיר' הרב כי בעבור שאם' בתקלת העין ויאמר אלהים לישראל במראת הלילה כי הוא ספר אמרה לא ספר מעשה לא היה קשה לאנקלום בספר המאמר כאשר נאם' במראו הלילה כי הוא ספר אמרה לא ספר מעשה שהיה כי יש הפרש גדוֹל בין מה שיאמ' בחלום או במארי הלילה ובין מה שיאמ' במחזה ובמראה ובין מה שיאמ' בדבר מוחלט וייח' רבר יי' אליו לאמר או ויאמר יי' אליו לאם' אלו דבריו וכן אמר שהייחק אנקלום השמיעה בכל מק' ויש' פירושה הגעת הדבר ההוא לבורא או קובל תפלת ויתרג' שמייע קדם יי' וקובלא אקובל קבילה ואמ' כן הדבר' בדבריו הרב למה יברח אנקלום מן הטענה וירחיק השמיעה נס כן מיראתו שתורה על נשמות ולא יברח מן האמר והדבר ולא מן הקריאה בשו' מקום בין בחלום

* Com. Gen. xlvii. 1.

בין במאמר' בין במאמר מוחלט כי בכלם יתרכז
ואמי' יי' מליל' יי' וקרא יי' למשה והוא נם היא תורה
על NAMES ויהיה לו לתרנ' ויתאמ' מן קדם יי' או
ואמי' יקרא די' או יותר עיי' כפי הראוי בענין כמו
שפוי' הרב בדייבור ובאמירה ולמה ירחיק השמיעה
ולא ירחיק הראה שתרגם אותן' וחזא' יי' ואשר אמי'
הרבות כי יורה על עניין השנת שכל באש' יורה על
השנת העין כי יש שהוא זה בשמיעה כי היא אמר
על ההשנה בשכל וברצון ברוב מקומות לנו
וישמע אברהם לכול שרי שמע קול תחוני נס כי
תרבו תפליה אינני שומע הנה שמעו מזבח טוב
והיה אם שמעו תשמעו לקו' יי' אלהיך וכן לב שומע
וכן רבי' והנה אנקלוי לא היה לו לירא מן השמיעה
שלא תורה רק על קבלת הדבר וחרצון בו ולא
ברחה מן הראה בשוי' מקו' אבל הרגנס אותן' כ פשוטה
בכל מקו' שהדבר מושג בראה בלבד אבל כאשר
איןנו מושג בראה בלבד והוא צריך השנהה
וחתבוננו יתרגנס כפי הראוי בו כאשר אמר כי
ראה יי' בעניי ראה ראיות את עני עמי וירא אלהי'
את בני ישראל שאין הראה בהם שיראה נופם
אבל שישנהה בענינים וידעו אותו זהה דרכו בכל
התורה לא כתעם שעלה בדעת הרב רצה בזה
למה שאמר פ' מה וירא יי' כי רבה רעת והשני
מקומות الآחרים שתרגם אותן' וחזא' אליו ולא
השלים אותו ובלשון העבריה הנה אנקלוס ותרגנס
ויעבר יי' על פניו ואעבר יי' שכינתיה על אפוי
שהיה הדבר העבר נברא לדעתו ולא זכיר לשון
תנוועה בבודא כפי מה שהזכיר הרב ואם כן איז

תרגם יי' אליהיך הוא עבר לפניו יי' אליהיך הוא עבר קדמן והנה זה מין חנועה בספר מעשה ולא יירא ממנו אנקלוס וכן בפסקוק וירא ישראל את היד הנדולות תרגם בו וחוא ישראל ית נבו' ידא רבתא נופל בו הנבו' מפני לשון אשר עשה והשאיר בו ידא רבתא ולא היה ירא ומתפחד מן היד ולא יכנה אותה כלל וכן נהג בתרנום כחובים באצבע אלהי באצבעא די' ומה שתירץ בו הרב כי ישם אנקלוס האצבע כל' נברא אשר פתח הלוח' בחפש הבורא איננו אמת כי הנה מימינו אש דת למו כתוב ימינה ולא פחד מן הימין הכותבת שתורה על נשמות וכן מן האצבע ועוד תרגם ידך החזקה ית ואמר ימינך יי' תברת שנאה ותרגם ידך החזקה ית ידך תקיפה ואם' בידא תקיפה ובאדרעה מרטמא וכן ותאחו במשפט ידי ותתקוף בדינא ידי וכן תרג' תדира עני יי' אליהיך בא מרישא דשתא והנה ביעקב כתוב בתקלה העין ויחלום והנה סולם מוצב ארץ ופחד אנקלוס ממנו ותרגם והוא יקרא די' מעד עליות ולא תרגם והוא יי' בעבור שהוא בחלום ותרגם והנה אני עמק והא מימיי בסעדך ולא אמר והוא אני עמק כמו שתרגם אני אהות עמק ואף על פי שהוא ספר דבר שנאמרו בחלום במוּתו בשוה ותרגם ואני אהיה עם פיך ואני אהיה עם פומך ואמר כי יאמר כי אהיה עמק זה לך האות ארי יהא מימיי עמר ועד נזהר אנקלוס בחלום ויתרגם ויבא אליהם אל אבימלך בחלום הלילה ויבא אליהם אל לבן בחלום ואתה מימר מן קדם יי' ואם תאמר שהחשש

שלא תרא הביאה קודמת לחלום ויהשב בה שהיא ממש הינה בשלמה כתוב בכתב גבעון נראה יי' אל שלמה בחלום הלילה ותרנס אותו יונתן אתנלי והוא לשלה ואמ' הדבר נאמר בחלום יספרו אותו כאשר נאמר בחלום ההוא ואל יקשה עליהם אף על פי שהוא אמר מאמ' יורה על הנשומות כי היוו בחלום יתרץ להם שאינו ממש נם כן הדבר שיאמר כי הוא נראה בחלום ראיו יספרו אותו כאשר הוא כי מה שנאמר בו שהוא בחלום הלילה ילמד שאינו ממש אבל הוא חלום שנדמה לו ממנו כן ואל תחשוב שהוא זה לונתן בע מפני שלא יאמר בארמית לשון ראייה בחלומות כי וארא בחלומי מתרנים וחווית ובנבוכדנצר חזה הייתה וכן תרגם אנקלוס לא עליינו תלונותיכם כי עליי אלהן על מימרא די' ואין כאן יראה ופחד מן הנשומות וכן ידבר העם באלהים ובמשה ואיתרכם עמא על מיטרא די' וכן בינו ובניכם ובין אלחים ובין כל נפש היה בין מימרי ומימרא די' וכיוצא בהן הרבה וכן תרגם יצף יי' יסך מימרא די' אלהים עד מימרא די' שהיר ואין לו בהן ראית הנשומות וنم אין למימרא עניין בכך שיאמר בו שיצפה וועיד וכן השבעה לי באלהים קיים לי במימרא די' וכן הנשבעים מזכירין אני נשבע במאמר אלהים וכיוצא כאלו רבים לאנקלוס וסודם ידוע למשכילים וכן בלשון עמידה אמר הרב שם יונתן בע כונתו לפרש בו קיום ולכך תרגם ועמדו רגליו ואתגלי גבורתיה וכן תרגם כל דבר עסך ותנוועה גבורתא והינה אנקלוס לא יתרא מלשון עמידה ותרנס ההני עמד לפניך

שם על הוצר הא أنا קאים קדמד תמן על טינרא
ומה שאמר הרב כי אנקלוס ישם עניין התנוועה גלי^ו
השכינה והראות כבוד נברא הנה אנקלוס מן
הכבד יברח מלהת בו כלשנות האלה ויתרנו^מ
וירא כבוד יי' אל כל העדה ואיתנלי יקרא די' כמו
שיאמר ויתנלי יי' ולא ויתרנו ואיתחו יקרא די' ובן
יתרנו במלאכיס ויתנלי ואם ידבר אנקלוס במלאכיס
ובכבוד נברא בענייני הנשומות כמו שאמר הרב
היה ראו שלא יתרא מן הראה שיראם האדם
ויתרנו בחם ואיתחו כמו שעשה כי ראי אליהם
פניהם אל פנים ארי חזית מלאכא די' וחש ושלום
שיהיה הדבר הנכבר שכינה או כבוד נברא חזע
מהשם הנכבר יתברך כאשר חשב הרב כאן
ובפרקם רבים מספרו והוא תרנו אם אין פניך
הולכים אם לית שכינתך מהלכა בינה ומשה לא
יחפוץ בלבת עמו כבוד נברא חזע מהשם הנכבר
יתברך שכבר אמר לו הקדוש ברוך הוא הנה
מלאכי יلد לפניך ולא היה מתרצה בכך אבל
היה מבקש שליך עמו האל בעצמו ובכבודו וכן
אחר ששמע השם בקולו ואמר לו גם את הדבר
זה אשר דברת עשה אמר משה יلد נא אדי
בקרבנו תהך לעש שכינה די' בינה וכן תרנו
לא תוכל לראות את פני לא תוכל למחז אפי
שכינתי ארי לא יחויני אינשא ואמר יונתן ב"ע
בריך יקרא די' מאתר בית שכינתי ואם הכבוד
זה ירצה בו הכתוב עצם הבורא ואמתו ויהיה
כמו הראני נא את לבוד שפירוש בו הרב כן הנה
הזכיר בו אתר ובית ושכינתי ואם יאמר שהוא

כבד נברא כדעתו של הרב בפסוק וכבוד יי' מלא את המשכן ווולטו איך יקבע בו ברוך והمبرך והמתפלל לכבוד נברא כעובד עבודה זורה ובדברי רבותינו דברים יורו על שם השכינה שהוא האל יתברך אבל העניינים האלה لأنקלוס ווונתן בן עוזיאל דברים ידועם בקבלה וסודם לירודעם חן ובמעמד הר סיני יתרגם אנקלוס כל מלת אליהם הנזכר בפרשה יקרא או מירא די' ובאשר הזכיר הפרשה השם המויחד לא יאמר בן והכל בהשנה ובחכמה ממנו ועוד אזכיר זה בעיה יתברך ומה שתרגם אנקלוס וידבר אליהם את כל הדברים האלה ומליל יי' טumo בזה משום שנאמר פנים בפנים דבר יי' אל כל קהלכם והמשכיל יבין אבל מה שאמר כאן אני אחות עמך רצח לדרמו בו מה שאמרו נלו למצדים שכינה עמהם שנאמר אני ארד עמך מצרים נלו לעילם שכינה עמהם שנאמר ושמתי כסאי בעילם והנה האמרה והורידה שווים כמו שפירשתי למעלה ולא היה יכול לתרגם אלא כן בשום פנים כאשר רמזותיו אבל שם ביעקב לא יתכן לתרגם והוא אני עמך בעבור כי שם כתוב והנה יי' נצב עליו והמשכיל יבין ומפני שמצא אנקלוס שאינו כפשוטו ממש שברח ממנו ועשה עניין עוז בלבד ואמר מיראי בסעך ולא אמר מיראי עמך כמו שאמר במשה : “ But the author of *More Nevochim*, Part i. “ c. 27. states, that for the Hebrew, I will descend “ with thee into Egypt, and will bring thee up “ again, the targum in like manner is, I will

“ descend with thee into Egypt, and will bring
“ thee up again; where he takes the opportunity
“ of expressing his high admiration of the
“ knowledge of Onkelos, averring, that in his
“ relation of any transaction in the Law, Onkelos
“ applies all his powers to remove from the divine
“ nature every idea of corporeity; and that what-
“ ever terms occur expressive of motion, such
“ idea of motion he thence transfers to the created
“ glory or providence of God, paraphrasing, And
“ the Lord descended—And the Lord manifested
“ himself; Let me go down and see—Let me
“ manifest myself and see; and, therefore, he
“ institutes the inquiry, why the targum of the
“ passage before us should be rendered exactly
“ as in the original—I will descend? To this
“ his reply is, that since in the opening of the
“ narrative the scripture had set forth, that God
“ spake unto Israel in a vision of the night; it
“ being the relation of a discourse, and not of an
“ action; there was no need for Onkelos to hesi-
“ tate about relating the speech in the manner it
“ had been uttered in the nocturnal vision; as it
“ was the relation, not of an action that had taken
“ place, but of a discourse. That there is a
“ wide difference between what is declared in a
“ dream or nocturnal vision; between what is
“ uttered in a prophetic trance; and what is

“ uttered in a real and proper speech, such as;
“ The word of the Lord came unto me, saying.
“ Thus argues the learned Rabbi. He asserts,
“ moreover, that Onkelos removes from the deity
“ the sense of hearing; which he expounds in the
“ targum by the object coming to the creator, or
“ the petition being received; adopting as para-
“ phrases—It was heard with the Lord—He
“ accepted his intreaty. But if the case actually
“ be, as the author has stated it, how comes it
“ to pass, I would ask, that Onkelos, from an
“ apprehension that they would imply corporeity,
“ should scruple to predicate motion, and should
“ remove the sense of hearing; but on no oc-
“ casion has abstained from the predicates of
“ saying, speaking, and calling, whether in a
“ dream, or in a vision, or in a real and actual
“ conference? In all these cases, the language
“ of the targum is—The Lord said—The Lord
“ spoke—The Lord called unto Moses. These
“ accidents, most unquestionably, imply corpo-
“ reity; and, therefore, according to the exposition
“ of the learned Rabbi, of saying and speaking
“ the targum ought to have been—It was said
“ from the Lord—The glory of the Lord said—
“ or, The Lord acquiesced; as the exigency of
“ the case might seem to require. Besides, why
“ does he remove the sense of hearing, but not

“ that of seeing; since for the latter the targum
“ is—And the Lord saw? For as to the de-
“ clarations of the author, that the verb employed
“ to denote ocular perception, has reference
“ equally to intellectual apprehension; the same,
“ or more, may be said of the verb, to hear;
“ which is to be understood of intellectual ap-
“ prehension and complacency, on numberless
“ occasions. Thus; And Abraham hearkened unto
“ the voice of Sarah—Hear the voice of my sup-
“ plications—Though ye multiply intreaty, I will
“ not hear—Behold, to hear is better than sacrifice
“ —And it shall be, if ye will hearken to the
“ voice of the Lord, your God—So also, a
“ hearing heart; not to mention many other
“ examples. Hence we may gather, that Onkelos
“ had no reason to be afraid of predicating the
“ verb, to hear, seeing that it has the signification
“ of accepting a thing, or of acquiescing in the
“ tenor of it. Neither has he, on any occasion,
“ avoided the use of the verb, to see; but, when-
“ ever the object of it is apprehensible by the
“ sight alone, he paraphrases it literally; and when
“ the object is not to be perceived by the sight,
“ he paraphrases it, as the context may seem to
“ require; as in the passages, For the Lord hath
“ beheld my affliction—Seeing I have seen the
“ affliction of my people—And God saw the

“ children of Israel ; these not being objects of
“ sight, that he should see their bodies, but that
“ he should attend to their distress, and take
“ proper notice of it : and this, be it observed,
“ is his usual mode of paraphrasing throughout
“ the whole of the Pentateuch ; not in the sense
“ ascribed to him by the learned Rabbi, that is
“ to say, according to what he has asserted in
“ his forty-eighth chapter on the passage, And
“ the Lord saw that the wickedness of men had
“ waxen great, together with the other two texts ;
“ that he has paraphrased them, and uses the
“ verb, to see ; but that the paraphrases are not
“ genuine. Moreover, according to the doctrine
“ of the learned Rabbi, in the accident of passing
“ Onkelos makes an addition to the sense ; para-
“ phrasing, And the Lord passed before his face
“ —And the Lord caused his Habitation to pass
“ before his face ; because, in his opinion ; that
“ which passes, is something created ; and be-
“ cause he does not predicate of the deity any
“ thing implying motion. But if this be true,
“ how happens it, I would ask, that of the text,
“ The Lord, thy God, himself passeth before
“ thee ; his targum should be, The Lord, thy
“ God, himself passeth before thee ? Doubtless,
“ this attribution is a species of motion, and that,
“ too, in the relation of something which had been

“ performed ; and yet we behold Onkelos not afraid
“ to affirm it. So also ; of the words, And Israel
“ saw the mighty hand, his paraphrase is—And
“ Israel saw the powerfulness of the mighty hand ;
“ where, in consideration of what had been
“ achieved, powerfulness, is asserted as the object ;
“ but, mighty hand, he still retains, and seems
“ to have been under no fear of ascribing it to
“ the deity ; employing it, as we see, without
“ any alteration. Such, too, is his way in pa-
“ raphrasing the construction, By the finger of
“ the Lord ; which he always renders—By the
“ finger of the Lord : for as to the illustration of
“ the learned Rabbi, that Onkelos makes the
“ finger a created instrument, which, at the
“ pleasure of the creator, unfolded the tablets, it
“ is wholly destitute of truth ; for the text, From
“ his own right hand received they a fiery law ;
“ he paraphrases, The writing of his own right
“ hand ; being herein no more afraid to attribute
“ the inditing right hand, notwithstanding it im-
“ plies corporeity, than he is to attribute the
“ finger. He, moreover, says ; Thy right hand
“ hath exalted—Thy right hand, O Lord, hath
“ bruised its enemies. Thy strong hand, he
“ paraphrases—Thy powerful hand ; and says—
“ By a mighty hand, and by an uplifted arm.
“ So again, And my hand shall be strong in

“ judgment, he renders—And my hand shall be
“ strong in judgment. In like manner, he para-
“ phrases and says—The eyes of the Lord, thy
“ God, are perpetually upon it from the beginning
“ to the end of the year. Now, of Jacob it is
“ expressly said in the commencement of the
“ narrative, that he dreamed, and, behold, there
“ was a ladder fixed to the earth ; but Onkelos,
“ avoiding the literal interpretation, paraphrases
“ the beginning of the subsequent pasuk—And
“ behold the glory of the Lord stood upon it ;
“ not, Behold the Lord; because it was in a dream.
“ So likewise, And behold I am with thee, he
“ renders—And behold my Word is thy support ;
“ he does not say, Behold I am with thee, as in
“ the paraphrase, I will go down with thee ;
“ although it is the relation of a speech, which
“ had been uttered in a dream equally with the
“ other. So again, And I will be with thy mouth ;
“ he renders—And I will be with thy mouth ;
“ and where it is said, For I will be with thee,
“ and this shall be a sign unto thee ; his targum
“ is—Behold my Word shall be with thee. More-
“ over, in dreams Onkelos is particularly on his
“ guard, having paraphrased the two texts, And
“ God came unto Abimelech in a dream of the
“ night ; And God came unto Laban in a dream ;
“ by—And the Word came from the Lord. Should

“ you say, that he was solicitous, lest the act of
“ coming should be anterior to the dream, and
“ that it should be considered as something real;
“ it may be answered, that of Solomon it is
“ written—In Gibeon the Lord appeared unto
“ Solomon, in a dream of the night; which, by
“ Jonathan, is paraphrased—The Lord mani-
“ fested himself unto Solomon. If the speech is
“ uttered in a dream, they report it as it was
“ spoken in that dream; nor ought this to be
“ objected to them, although the speech should
“ imply corporeity; for since it takes place in a
“ dream only, they can plead for themselves, that
“ it is not real. The thing too, which is said to
“ appear in the dream, they do rightly to report
“ it as it is; as the bare mention, that it hap-
“ pened in a dream by night, is sufficient to
“ shew, that it is nothing in reality; but is a
“ dream, which is likened to that thing by him-
“ self. Nor let it be imagined, that Jonathan
“ ben Uziel has so paraphrased, because that, in
“ the Chaldee dialect, the expression, to see in
“ dreams, is not in use; for, And I saw in my
“ dream, is, in the Targum, And I saw; and of
“ Nebuchadnezzar it is said, And I saw in my
“ dream. Moreover, for the text, Your mur-
“ murings are not against us, but against
“ Jehovah; the targum of Onkelos is—But

“ against the Word of Jehovah; where there
“ was no need at all to have been afraid of cor-
“ poreity. In like manner the passage, And the
“ people spoke against God, and against Moses;
“ is paraphrased—And the people murmured
“ against the Word of Jehovah. So again,
“ Between me and you; Between God and every
“ living creature; are paraphrased—Between my
“ Word—Between the Word of Jehovah; the
“ like to which we find in an infinite number of
“ places. So also the targum of, Jehovah shall
“ pour out, is—The Word of Jehovah shall
“ pour out; of, God is witness—The Word of
“ Jehovah is witness; in which the paraphrast
“ could have entertained no fears about cor-
“ poreity; neither would it be sense to affirm of
“ the Word, considered as a word, that it poured
“ out, or, that it was a witness. In like manner,
“ Swear unto me by God, is paraphrased—Swear
“ unto me by the Word of Jehovah: and so
“ those who swear, say, I swear by the Word
“ of God; not to mention many similar con-
“ structions to be found in Onkelos, the true
“ import and mystery of which are known to
“ the intelligent. Moreover, in respect of the
“ accident of standing, the learned Rabbi asserts,
“ that Jonathan ben Uziel has studiously applied
“ himself to render it by, firmness; and, there-

“ fore, the text, And his feet stood ; he para-
“ phrases—And his might appeared ; and so,
“ in like manner, every instance of acting and
“ moving he paraphrases by, might. Certain it
“ is, however, that Onkelos by no means is afraid
“ to predicate the accident of standing ; but the
“ text, Behold I will stand before thee there
“ in the rock ; he paraphrases—Behold I will
“ stand before thee there in the rock. But fur-
“ ther, as to the assertion of the author, that
“ Onkelos makes motion signify the manifestation
“ of the Habitation, or, the displaying of the
“ created glory ; it is very clear, that Onkelos
“ scrupulously avoids giving to the glory any
“ such signification : for of the words, And the
“ glory of the Lord appeared unto all the as-
“ sembly ; his targum is—And the glory of the
“ Lord appeared ; just as he says—And the Lord
“ appeared ; he does not say in the targum—
“ And the glory of the Lord was seen. Nay,
“ he even paraphrases, and affirms of the angels ;
“ And he appeared or manifested himself. But
“ if, as the learned Rabbi contends, Onkelos had
“ actually regarded the angels and the created
“ glory as bodily substances ; there would have
“ been no need for him to have abstained from
“ speaking of them as objects of mortal sight :
“ but he might have paraphrased, and said of

“ them—And he was seen ; in the manner he
“ has rendered the words, For I have seen God
“ face to face ; the targum being—For I have
“ seen the angel of the Lord. God forbid,
“ however, that what is called the Habitation,
“ or the created glory ; should, as the author in
“ this, and several other chapters of his work,
“ seems to have imagined, be any thing distinct
“ from Jehovah himself, blessed be he. The
“ words, If thy presence do not go with us ; the
“ Targumist renders—If thy Habitation do not
“ go with us. Now Moses would never have
“ acquiesced in a created glory proceeding along
“ with him without the glorious name, blessed be
“ he ; as the Lord had already said, Behold my
“ angel shall go before thee ; but with this he was
“ not satisfied ; on the contrary, he urged the
“ request, that the deity would go along with
“ him, in his own person and glory. So, after
“ that the Lord had hearkened to his voice, and
“ said ; The thing, which thou hast mentioned,
“ I will also grant ; Moses saith, Let my Lord,
“ I pray, proceed amongst us ; the targum—
“ Let the Habitation of Jehovah, now, proceed
“ amongst us. So again, the targum of, Thou
“ canst not see my face ; is—Thou canst not
“ see the face of my Habitation ; for no man
“ shall see me. Jonathan ben Uziel, moreover,

“ says ; Blessed be the glory of Jehovah from
“ the place of the temple of his Habitation.
“ Now, since by, glory, in scripture, is meant
“ the very substance and essence of the creator ;
“ and that interpreted, as in the text ; Let me,
“ I pray, behold thy glory ; according to the
“ exposition of the learned Rabbi himself ; we,
“ therefore, have here the properties of place,
“ temple, and, that it dwells, expressly commen-
“ morated of it : but, if we maintain, according
“ to the opinion of the author in the pasuk, And
“ the glory of the Lord filled the temple, and so
“ forth, that it is a created glory ; how can it be
“ affirmed of it, that it is blessed ; not to mention,
“ that the person is blessing and intreating a
“ created glory, in the manner of an idolater ?
“ In the writings of the Fathers, there are many
“ passages, which inculcate respecting the name
“ of the Habitation, that it is God himself. But
“ these constructions of Onkelos and Jonathan
“ ben Uziel are things to be learnt in the Cabbala ;
“ and to those, that enjoy the favor, their mys-
“ tical import is revealed. In the station on
“ mount Sinai ; wherever, throughout the whole
“ section, the term, Elohim, God, occurs ; the
“ targum has either the glory, or the Word, of
“ Jehovah : but, wherever, Jehovah, or Lord,
“ occurs ; the targum is otherwise ; all which,

“ no doubt, has been considerately and wisely
“ designed by him, as with the divine assistance
“ I shall hereafter take occasion to shew. That
“ the text, And God spoke all these words, should
“ be rendered by Onkelos, And Jehovah spoke
“ all these words: is not any exception to the
“ position laid down: his reason for so doing
“ being, because it is elsewhere said, The Lord
“ spoke face to face unto all the congregation;
“ which the intelligent will not fail to consider.
“ But with respect to the targum now before us,
“ I will go down with thee; it was intended to
“ insinuate what they say in the Talmud: If
“ they were exiled to Egypt, the Habitation was
“ with them; as it is written, I will descend
“ with thee into Egypt; if they were exiled to
“ Elam, the Habitation was with them; as it is
“ written, And I will set my throne in Elam.
“ Now, as I have already observed above, saying,
“ and, descending, are of equal import, and there
“ was no possibility of paraphrasing otherwise
“ than this, as I have intimated before; but of
“ Jacob it would have been inconsistent to have
“ paraphrased, And behold I am with thee; be-
“ cause it is there written, And behold Jehovah
“ stood on the top of it; which let him, that
“ understands, duly consider: for Onkelos per-
“ ceiving, that it was not to be taken literally,

“ abstained from paraphrasing it as such; re-
“ stricting its signification to that of help only,
“ and saying—My Word is thy support; not—
“ My Word is with thee; as he had said of
“ Moses.” It were useless to dilate on the
veracity and importance of these remarks of
Nachmanides, which, whilst they fully attest the
correctness and extent of his own erudition, com-
pletely overthrow the principle on which R. Moses
ben Maimon has attempted to illustrate the lan-
guage of Onkelos; and especially in its appli-
cation to what is more immediately the subject
of this chapter, the Word and the Habitation of
Jehovah. The import of these two phrases,
indeed, he has no where, himself, particularly
defined; but satisfied with having refuted the
opinion of Maimonides, he refers us to those who
have a knowledge of the Cabbala, which, we
may rest assured whatever it may inculcate re-
specting them, will add no sanction to the belief;
that they are created existences, and substituted
by the Targumists for the purpose of removing
from our minds all idea or notion of corporeity
in the godhead. This it was the more necessary
to notice, on the present occasion; because, with
christian writers in general, the positions of
Maimonides are held to be of the very highest
authority in the Jewish church; and, therefore,

in all] questions of theology, they are absurdly admitted as the very canons of the synagogue ; though nothing can be more remote from the real principles of Judaism, nor at greater variance with the most established opinions of the Jewish people, than many positions of Maimonides. The fact is this. In a knowledge of the Talmud, of the mathematics, of the Greek and Arabic philosophy, and of profane literature in general, Maimonides vastly excelled the rest of his countrymen, and is deservedly reputed an authority of the first rank ; but in a knowledge of the Targumin, of the Cabbala, and of the more abstruse parts of scripture, he has been infinitely surpassed by others ; and, in any one of these departments of learning, either Nachmanides himself, or Bechai, or Alshech, or Abarbinel, is worthy of the preference.

But there is still another objection, which remains to be answered, before I can close this part of my subject. It has been repeatedly urged by writers of the very highest authority in this department of learning, that there are instances of this phraseology of the Targumists being applied to men, in the same manner as to God ; and that it cannot possibly be any thing else than a mere idiom of the dialect. To obviate this objection, completely, I shall produce

all the passages that are to be found of this complexion; and then demonstrate the invalidity of the grounds, on which it is advanced. The passages are those which follow : *עינך במימרי : “ Thy eye is upon my word, and I am not.” †ארום פסק טוב נשמי במימרי ורואה : “ But seeing that my rational part still decides in my word, and the spirit of God is yet in my nostrils.” ‡קמיה ותתבין במימרי : “ I rise; but thou disregardest my word.” §דנען סיפא בין מיריה ובין מיכל בת שאול : “ Who placed a sword between his word and Michal, the daughter of Saul, the wife of David.” || קיימת בין מיריה ובין מירך : “ There is a league between my word and thy word.” ¶ונזאר יהודע קיים בין מיריה ובין כל עמא : “ Jehoiada struck a league between his word, and between all the people, and between the word of the king; that they should become a people, serving Jehovah.” **אצרית במימרי אתנורית : “ I said in my word, I am cut off from the world.” †‡ואכתב בשום מירא דמלךא : “ And he wrote in the name of the

* Job, c. vii. v. 8.

† Job, c. xxvii. v. 3.

‡ Job, c. xxx. v. 20.

§ Ruth, c. iii. v. 8.

|| 2 Chron. c. xvi. v. 3.

¶ 2 Chron. c. xxiii. v. 16.

** Lam. c. iii. v. 54.

†† Esther, c. viii. v. 10.

***וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה לְנֹחַ דָא אֶת** “word of king Xerxes.” **קִיּוּם דְקִיּוּמִית בֵין מִימְרִי וּבֵין מִימְרֵךְ כָל בְּסָרָא דָעֵל:** “And Jehovah said to Noah, This is “the covenant which I have established between “my word, and between the word of all flesh “upon the earth.” These are all the examples to be found, in which the term, **מִימְרֵךְ**, *word*, is apparently applied to man, in the same manner that it is to God. In making this assertion, I rely on the testimony of no author whatever; as I have all the Targumin, and have carefully perused them for the very purpose of conducting this argument with the utmost degree of accuracy.

Now the first thing that must strike the reader, in contemplating the above examples, is, that they are all of them, without exception, from the most modern of the Targumin, and those but few in number. Neither Onkelos on the Law, nor Jonathan on the prophets, nor the Jerusalem Targumist, nor Jose on the Psalms, nor the major part of the Targumists on the other books of scripture; furnish any instances whatever. To grant, then, on the authority of the foregoing examples, that, in one or two of the most recent Targumin, the word of a person is used as an idiom for the person himself; it will by no means follow, that the Word of Jehovah, in its

* Jonathan ben Uziel, Gen. ix. 17.

personal application, has no other meaning than Jehovah himself. Let this be exemplified from what we know of other idioms ; and, especially, of the sacred dialects. In Hebrew and Chaldee both, nothing is so common as to say, By the hand of such a person or thing, when connected to a verb as the instrument of action. Now if applied to a man, as ; by the hand of Moses, it has a distinct and proper signification ; but if to any thing not endued with hands, as ; by the hand of a rock, it has no such propriety, and is to be tolerated only from the consideration, that it is an idiom of the dialect. So the term, Word, if applied to Jehovah, who employed his Word only, and the world was created by it, without the co-operation or instrumentality of any other being ; has a personal import and signification peculiar to the subject ; but if to a man, who absolutely can perform nothing by means of his word, without the assistance of others to put it into execution ; it has no such personal import, but must signify either a word of mouth, according to its common acceptation, or nothing ; and makes no nearer an approximation in sense to, the Word of Jehovah, than, the hand of a rock, does, to, the hand of Moses.

Thus I should argue, on the concession that the idiom in question really existed ; and, that the

examples before us were a certain confirmation of it. The fact is, however, not one of those supposed proofs is of any validity; as the term, word, in each of them, is actually used for the word of speech, either conceived or expressed. In all the instances out of Job, it is put for the personal pronoun, in the Hebrew; and is an illustration of the text, as will immediately appear. In the first of them, the patriarch having dwelt largely on the misery and brevity of human life, adds to his other declarations; Thine eyes be upon me, and I am not; but, according to the Targumist; Thine eyes be upon my word, that is, upon what I am now saying, and I am not, that is, and I expire as it were with the conclusion of my speech. In the second, the Hebrew runs, As long as my soul is in me; but, the Targum, seeing that my soul still decides in my speech, that is, since my reason determines every thing which I speak, and the spirit of God subsists in my nostrils; my lips shall not utter wickedness, nor my tongue articulate deceit. The other case is so self-evident, that it requires but little consideration. I stand up, that is, I stand up to plead; and thou regardest not my word, that is, but thou regardest not what I say.

To perceive the real meaning of the term in that instance from Ruth, we must take into the

account the delicacy of the subject. The sacred historian had represented Ruth as coming privately to Boaz in the night time, whilst he lay exhilarated by the juice of the grape on his corn-heap; and as uncovering his feet, in order that, by so doing, she might rouse him from sleep, and thus have an opportunity of revealing her kindred. This the Targumist not only translates, but by way of applauding the chastity of Boaz on the occasion, compares his conduct with that of Joseph to his mistress, as also with that of Paltiel, the son of Laish; who, according to a Talmudic tradition to be found in Masseceth Sanhedrin,* fixed a sword between himself; but according to the Targumist, between his word, that is, between his honor, or his chastity; and Michal, the daughter of Saul, the wife of David.

The two examples from the second book of Chronicles may be regarded as one; the latter of which will easily explain the former, as well as the similar instance from Jonathan ben Uziel. Here the Targumist says, that Jehoiada struck a league between his word, and between all the people, and between the word of the king; that is, Jehoiada interposed the solemnity and formality of an oath between the word, or joint declaration of himself, the people, and the king;

* Perek ii. § 4.

which word or declaration was, that the people should become the servants of Jehovah only. In the other it runs, There is a league between my word and thy word; where, though the word or mutual declaration of both the parties be not recorded, as in the former case; it must be understood; as men are not wont to strike leagues, and take oaths, without having first declared their intentions in a settled and preconcerted form of words.

That from the *Lamentations of Jeremiah* is an expression of the utmost propriety. Man, in other languages, is represented as saying a thing sometimes within himself, or within his own mind; but the fact is, whatever thought or sentiment has been once adequately conceived, is always tacitly expressed by words in the mind. So the Targumist; I said in my word, that is, in the speech of my mind, I am cut off from the world. This form of expression is found several times in the targum of *Ecclesiastes*, as also in that of the second book of *Chronicles*; of which, however, I shall content myself with giving severally the references in the margin.*

The last but one of the instances, from the book of *Esther*, gives the term in the acceptation

* *Ecc.* i. 2; ii. 1; vi. 3; vii. 24; viii. 14, 18; ix. 16.
2 *Chron.* xxv. 19. Jonathan ben Uziel, *Num.* xv. 32.

of order or decree; a sense which it is allowed to have on other occasions: And he wrote by the authority of an order of king Xerxes.

These are certainly all the examples to be found in the Targumin, in which the term, word, can be supposed to have a reciprocal signification, when applied to man; and to militate against the asserted distinction between Jehovah and his Word. That they may be satisfactorily rendered without any regard to such reciprocity of meaning, has been now demonstrated; though, if that could not have been done, from the paucity of the examples, the existence of the idiom might have been justly disputed.

There is yet another argument, on which I would lay some stress; that, though many of the Rabbinical authors have indulged in the idioms and style of the Targumin, not one of them has ever used this form; a sure sign to me, that they did not regard it in the light of an idiom, otherwise they would doubtless have adopted it as well as the rest.

From a full and candid examination, then, of the targumic interpreters, prosecuted with every deference to those scruples and objections which lay in its way; there is legal and rational ground for determining, that the personal distinction which we maintain between the Word of Jehovah and

Jehovah himself, together with their identity of substance, was the antient doctrine of the Jewish church ; and that those who deny either the difference of their personality, or the unity of their nature, are unable to allege any solid or substantial evidence, in support of their assertions. The certainty of this argument however, though already fixed on the firmest foundation, derives additional confirmation from the combined testimonies of Philo Judæus and R. Moses Alshech ; whose authority on the present question is the more to be admired, because, if we except their extraction and system of worship, they had scarcely any thing in common, being of different countries and languages, the one having composed his works in Greek, the other in Hebrew, and living at an interval of fourteen hundred years from each other ; so that the only supposition, on which we can account for their marvellous agreement with the doctrine here inculcated, must of necessity be, that their ideas, on this head, they had equally imbibed from one and the same spring.

The writings of Philo abound with commemorations of the divine Word ; but, as he was highly conversant in the philosophy of the Platonic school, it may not be unwise, in the first place, to make him give his own definition of the term, in order that his conceptions of it may be seen to

flow, not from Greek but Jewish original. Now, *Logos*, in general; which may signify either, word, or, thought; reason, or, speech; but which I shall uniformly render by Word only, he has thus defined :* *Διτίος γαρ ο λόγος, εν τε τω πάντι, και εν ανθρώπῳ φύσει· κατα μεν το πάντα, ο, τε περι τῶν ασωματῶν και παραδειγματικῶν ιδεῶν, εξ αν ο νοότος επαγν κοσμος, και ο περι τῶν ορατῶν, α δη μιμηματα και απεικονισματα τῶν ιδεῶν εκείνων εστιν αν ο αισθητος οτος απετελείτο· εν ανθρώπῳ δ' ο μεν εστιν ενδιαθετος, ο δε προφορικος· και ο μεν οια τις πηγη, ο δε γεγωνος, απ' εκείνης ρεων· και τι μεν εστι χωρα το πνευμονικου, τι δε κατα προφοραν, γλωττακαι στομα και η αλλη ωσα φωνης οργανωποια.*

“ Word is twofold; that which regards the universe, and that which obtains in the nature of man. The mundane Word has place as well in the immaterial and exemplary forms, from which the intellectual world is compacted, as in things visible; which are the likenesses and portraits of those forms, and of which this material or sensible frame is composed. But the human Word is partly intrinsic, and partly prolatative; the former of which being, as it were, the fountain, and the latter the stream running from it. The seat of the one is the mind; but of the prolatative the tongue, the mouth, together with the other instrumental parts of the voice or speech.” From this it is

* *De Vit. Mos. lib. iii. p. 672.*

apparent, how much the *Logos* of Philo is of Jewish, and how much of Platonic, extraction. The distinctions of, intrinsic, and, prolatice, which he here applies to the human word, are, unquestionably, Platonic; but the notion of a mundane Word is exclusively Jewish; and the manner in which the author makes mention of it throughout the whole of his works, will be intelligible to those only, who have read what the Talmudists have written of the Metatron, and the Cabbalists of Wisdom. The subsequent extracts will shew the correctness of this assertion:*

Καθαπέρ γαρ τινα τοιμην, γην καὶ υδωρ καὶ αέρα καὶ τοῦρ, καὶ οσα εν τύποις φυτα τε αν καὶ ζωα, τα μεν θυμτα τα δε θεια· ετι δε γραντι φυσιν, καὶ πλια καὶ σεληνης τερειδούς καὶ των αλλων αστερων τροπας τε αν καὶ Χορειας εναρμονιους, ως τοιμην καὶ βασιλευς ο θεος αγει κατα δικην καὶ νομον, προστησαμενος του ορθιον αυτω λογον πρωτογονον ιησου, ος την επιμελειαν της ιερας ταυτης αγελης, οια τι μεγαλε βασιλεως υπαρχος διαδεξεται.

Και γαρ ειρηται τω· Ιδου εγω ειμι, αποστελω αγγελον μη εις προσωπον σω τη φυλαξαι σε εν τη οδω· “ For God, as it were a shepherd and a king, rules, like a flock, according to law and equity, the elements of earth, water, air, and fire; and whatever they contain, whether plants or animals, mortals or immortals; together with the pure nature of the heavens, the revolutions of the sun and

* De Agricult. p. 195.

“ moon, the regular returns and circumvolutions
 “ of the other stars; having appointed his up-
 “ right Word and first begotten son, like the
 “ viceroy of a mighty king, to undertake the
 “ superintendance of this sacred flock. For in
 “ a certain place it is written: Behold I am, I
 “ will send my angel before thy face, to guard
 “ thee in the way.” In like manner on another
 occasion:*

Καν μηδεπω μεντοι τυγχανη της αξιοχρεως αν
 νιος θεος προσαγορευεσθαι, σπουδαζε κοσμεισθαι κατα τον πρω-
 τογονον αυτην, λογον τον αγγελον πρεσβυτατον, ως αρχαγγε-
 λον πολυωνυμον παρχοντα. και γαρ αρχη, και ονομα
 θεος, και λογος, και ο κατ' εικονα ανθρωπος, και οραν Ισραηλ
 προσαγορευεται. διο προχθην ολιγω προτερον επαινεσαι τας
 αρχας των Φασκοντων, οτι παντες εσμεν οιοι ενος ανθρωπου
 και γαρ ει μηπω μηνοι θεος παιδες γομιζεσθαι γεγοναμεν,
 αλλα τοι της αιδια εικονος αυτη λογη τα ιερωτατα. θεος γαρ
 εικων, λογος ο πρεσβυτατος. “ But, if there be no
 “ one worthy of being styled the son of God,
 “ do thou strive to be adorned like his first be-
 “ gotten Word, the eldest angel; being, as it
 “ were, an archangel of many names. For he
 “ is called, Beginning, Name of God, Word,
 “ Man after an image, and Israel seeing. Where-
 “ fore, I was induced, a little before, to applaud
 “ the origin of those who said: For we are all
 “ the sons of one man. For, if we are not fit to

* *De Confus. Ling.* p. 341.

“ be thought the children of God, as yet; we
 “ may, at least, of his everlasting image, his
 “ most sacred Word; as the most ancient Word
 “ is the image of God.” So also :* Τριχως δε
 επινοειται τοπος* απαξ μεν, χωρα υπο σωματος εκπεπλη-
 ρωμενη· κατα δευτερου δε τροπου, ο θεος λογος, ον εκπε-
 πληρωκεν ολου δι ολων ασωματοις δυναμεσιν αυτος ο θεος. Ειδον
 γαρ, φησι, του τοπου ειστηκει ο θεος του Ισραηλ, ενω μονον και
 ερουργειν αφηκεν, αλλαχοθι καλυσας* ειρηται γαρ αναβαλλειν εις
 τον τοπον ον αν εκλεξηται κυριος ο θεος, κακει θνει τα ολοκαυ-
 τωματα και σωτηρια, και τας αλλας αρματις θυσιας αναγειν
 κατα δε τριτον σημαντικευον, αυτος ο θεος καλειται τοπος, τω
 περιεχειν μεν τα ολα, περιεχεσθαι δε τρισ μηδενος απλως, και
 τω καταφυγην των συμπαντων ειναι αυτον; και επειδηπερ αυτος
 εστι χωρα αυτω, κεχωρηκως εαυτου και εμφερομενος μονω εαυτω.

“ The term, place, has three significations. First,
 “ it denotes the space which is occupied by any
 “ body. Secondly, the divine Word, which God
 “ himself hath filled all in all with spiritual
 “ powers. I saw, saith he, the place where the
 “ God of Israel stood; in which alone he hath
 “ given permission to sacrifice, having forbidden
 “ it to be done any where else. The command
 “ is, to ascend to the place which the Lord God
 “ may chuse, and there to sacrifice the whole
 “ burnt offerings, and the peace offerings; and
 “ thither to bring the unblemished sacrifices.

* De Som. p. 574.

“ Thirdly, God himself is called Place, in that
 “ he surrounds all things, but is himself sur-
 “ rounded by nothing at all ; in that he is the
 “ retreat of every thing; and, forasmuch as he
 “ is his own place, taking in himself, and borne
 “ within himself.” So again :* *Δυο γαρ, ως εοικεν,*
ιερα θεος, εν μεν οδε ο κοσμος, εν ω και αρχιερευς ο πρωτογονος
αυτης θεος λογος επερον δε λογικη ψυχη, τοις ιερευς ο προς
αληθειαν αυθεωπος, ο μιμημα αισθητον ο τας πατριους ευχα-
τε θυσιας επιτελων εστι. “ There are, it seems, two
 “ temples of God ; the one this world, in which
 “ the chief priest is his first begotten divine
 “ Word ; the other the rational soul, the priest
 “ of which is real man, whose sensible likeness
 “ he is that offers vows and sacrifices, according
 “ to the institutes of his country.” From these
 and such like testimonies it clearly appears, that
 Philo must have derived his knowledge of the
 divine Word, not from the Greek authors ; but
 either from the targumin of Onkelos and Jo-
 nathan, or what, perhaps, is still more probable,
 from some cabbalistic fountain to which both he
 and the Targumists had equal access. Indeed, it
 would be in vain to search amongst the Greek
 philosophers for any thing like an illustration
 of what the author has here commemorated of
 the Word of God. For, not to mention the doc-

* De Som. p. 579.

trine of a mundane Word, which was wholly unknown to the Grecian schools; in what heathen writings shall we find the term, Place, appropriated as a name either to God or to his Word; or this latter denominated, The many named archangel, The name of God, that is, Jehovah, or Shaddai; The first begotten son of God, The man after the image, or Israel seeing? But all these titles, if we except that of, First begotten son of God, which, I believe, is peculiar to Philo, are even now to be found mentioned in the works of the Targumists, Talmudists, and Cabballists; and not only that, but mentioned in such a manner as to render it apparent, that they are meant of the same person; as in the course of this volume will be completely manifested. From the evidence, then, of Philo Judæus, who flourished within a very few years after Onkelos and Jonathan, there exists just ground for concluding that, with the most ancient divines of the Jewish church in general, and with the targumic interpreters in particular, the Word of Jehovah was regarded as a divine personality of the godhead; distinct in subsistency, but not in essence, from Jehovah himself.

To the authority of Philo I proceed to add that of R. Moses Alshech, who, in speaking of the ten words or speeches of God, whereby, accord-

ing to the Talmudists, every thing was created; strenuously maintains the existifying power of the divine Word, by which alone the thing spoken, whatever it might be, was made to subsist without any other cause. The ten words or speeches, whereby the world is said to have been created, are put for the ten acts or articulations of the divine Word; for the divine Word itself, being always one and the same subsisting faculty or personality of the godhead, can have no plural; but the times of its articulation, or of its displaying its energy, may be many in number; and for this reason it is, that in the Talmudic tradition alluded to, as well as in the illustrations of R. Moses Alshech, the ten utterances or articulations of the divine Word are called the ten words. Thus much being premised, the following most learned comment of our author will be found to apply to the argument under consideration.

אמנם לבא אל הביאור נקדמים שניים:
 הקדמות מפורסמות לモזאי דעת אחד כי הלא
 כאשר נראה בצאת דבר מפי איש יצא הבעל פיו
 כן נציר בדבריו כי יצא יתפשט שפע ימשל
 אל הבעל פה בדבריו יתברך כי אם שיתחלקו בפי
 איכרי הדובר כי האדם למה שהוא גשמי נס הבעל
 חולף ובלתי קיים ומשל קדוש זולתי זכות הדבר
 בהיותו על דית ומצוה אמן הוא יתברך למה

* Shushanath Haamakim, fol. 2. col. 1.

שאין חקר לקדושתו נם הבעל פיו לא יערכנו מלאך
 ושרף הלא יעד מקרה שכחוב בדבר ה' שמים
 געש וברוח פיו כל צבאם הוא מורה באצבע שרוח
 פיו שבמאמר היה מהויה כל צבא השמי' והענין
 כי לא יציר אצלו יתברך דבר לגדולתו כנודע
 רק שמשכינתו היא כסא כבודו המתואר לפה
 להיויתו מוצא אל שפע השנחתו והשפעתו יתברך
 אל העולם השפל מתוכיות הנקרה פה יצא שפע
 וכח קדושה מתחפש חוצה והוא מתוך איכותו
 בהבעל פה המדבר היוצא מתוכיותו בדברו וע"י
 ההתפשטות מתעבה הצד מה עד השמי' קול
 ואותו הכח היוצא מתחפש הוא הפועל בו כי
 אין ספק כי העשרה מאמרות שביהם נברא העולם
 כי רוח פיו יתברך במאמר עצמו היה מהויה כל
 הנדבר בו וזה לא יבצר מכל מאמר מה אשר
 יצא מפיו ית' בדבר שנאמר כי כאשר ירד הנשס
 ונרי בן יהיה דברי אשר יצא מפי לא ישוב אליו
 ריקם ב"א עשה את אשר הפטתי והצליח את אשר
 שלחתיו הנה כי הדבר בעצמו הוא הפועל וועשה
 ומצליה את אשר ישתחה ומה נם עתה כאשר
 יהיה דברו ית' אשר יצא מפי ממאמרי תורתו
 שאין קצה לקדושתה כי אז ערך אל קדושת
 רוחניות הבעל אשר אז יצא מפי יתברך כי היה
 כמאziel ומשיך בהבעל פיו בכל דבר ודבר
 מרותניות עצם סוד קדושה המתויחסת אליו יתברך
 מפנימיות ספירותות התורה הבלתי נפרדת מאותו
 ית' כנודע עם שלא יברר הלויך הדברו ומשתלשל
 ומתחבה הצד מה באופן יסכלנו חומר האדם וישמעו

ישראלא את קולו ומה מתכו דברי רזיל במדרש חיית
 באומרים על דברות מתן תורה זיל וויש אומרים
 שנגעה מפיו ונחתן לו שנאמר כי ה' יתנו חכמה
 מפיו דעת ותבונה שורה כי דבריו פיו יחברן
 בתורה אשר תצא מפיו הוא מאיכות התייחס אל
 דבר גנוו תוק פיו ית' ובכון לא יפלא היהת הדבר
 דבר רוחני מאד קיים לעד יכול איש שלם לדבר
 בו כאשר ידבר עם אחד מללאכי עליון עם שנדר
 הדבר עלה על כלם מעלה מעלה כמאמר זיל פרק
 אין דורשין כל דבר ודבר שיוצא מפי הק'בה נברא
 מלאך ממנו שנאמר וברוח פיו כל צבאים ע"ב הנה
 מלתי אומר נעשה מלאך יורה שאיכותו לעלה
 מן מלאך שמננו על ידי התפשותו נברא המלאך
 וזה ממנו נברא מלאך הוא מה שבתנו על רוח
 פיו כל צבאים כי עי הבל פיו היה מהוה וצבא
 השמים הם המלאכים כי איכות הדבר יעה
 עליהם מאד : To illustrate this, we shall pre-
 mise two things, well known to the learned.
 First, that as, on the issuing of a word from
 the mouth of a man, we see the breath exhale
 from his mouth ; so do we imagine, that, in
 the Word of God, there proceeds or extends,
 on his speaking, a self-diffusing influx, which
 is assimilated to the exhalation of the mouth ;
 only they differ from each other with respect to
 the quality of the speaker. For man, being
 a bodily substance, his exhalation is transient
 and evanescent, and quite unholy ; except so

“ far as the word spoken may have any merit in
“ it, by its being agreeable to the law and the
“ precept; but the deity being of infinite holi-
“ ness, the very exhalation of his mouth is
“ unequaled in rank by either angel or seraph.
“ Doth not the scripture testify so much, where
“ it says: The heavens were made by the Word
“ of Jehovah, and all the host of them by the
“ breath of his mouth; which plainly demonstrates,
“ that the breath of his mouth, which was in the
“ Word, gave being to the host of heaven?
“ The fact is, that with God, as is well known,
“ there is no word imaginable to express his
“ greatness; but from his Habitation, that is to
“ say, from the Throne of his Glory, which is
“ denominated mouth, seeing that he causes the
“ exuberance of his divine care and influence
“ to extend to the lower world; from a mediety,
“ I say, called the mouth, there proceeds an
“ influx and holy efficacy, extending itself out-
“ wardly; that is to say, from the mediety of
“ his individual essence, by an exhalation of the
“ mouth of the speaker, issuing from his mediety,
“ whilst he speaks, and assuming, by means of
“ the extension, a somewhat grosser form, so as
“ to render the voice audible: nor is the agent of
“ the action any thing else, than the very power
“ itself so proceeding and diffused. For as to the

“ ten words, whereby the world was created,
“ there can be no doubt, that the breath of his
“ mouth, blessed be he, which was in the words,
“ was itself the cause of existence to every thing
“ spoken in it; and the same may be said of any
“ speech whatever, that proceeds from his mouth,
“ blessed be he; like unto the Word, of which it
“ is affirmed in the scripture: For as the rain
“ descendeth, &c. so shall my Word be, which
“ proceedeth from my mouth: it shall not return
“ to me vainly, without doing that which I please,
“ and accomplishing that for which I may have
“ sent it. Hence we see, that the Word, by
“ itself, acts, makes, and effectuates, what is com-
“ mitted to its charge. Such, too, is the case
“ here; as his Word, blessed be he, which hath
“ proceeded from his mouth, is of the words of
“ his law, which is of infinite holiness. For,
“ on the promulgation of the law, nothing could
“ be comparable to the holiness of the spirituality
“ of the exhalation, which at that time issued
“ from the mouth of Jehovah; because in every
“ word, by the exhalation of his mouth, he
“ caused, as it were, to be emanated and drawn
“ somewhat of the spirituality of the quintessence
“ of that holiness, which refers its extraction to
“ the deity; somewhat of the interior of the
“ pellucidities of the law, which, as all know,

“ is inseparable from God himself, blessed be he ;
“ notwithstanding that the Word moved forth,
“ and extended itself, and to a certain degree
“ acquired a denser form, in order that corporeal
“ man might perceive it, and that Israel might
“ hear its voice. How fine, too, is the language
“ of our Rabbies of blessed memory, in *Medrash*
“ *Chazith*; where they speak of the words of the
“ giving of the law, to the following effect.
“ Some affirm, that he sucks it from his mouth ;
“ and, that he gives to him ; according to the
“ scripture : For the Lord, from his mouth,
“ giveth wisdom, knowledge and understanding ;
“ This clearly teaches, that the words of his mouth,
“ blessed be he, in the law, which proceedeth
“ from his mouth, are of a quality wholly related
“ to something hidden within his mouth, blessed
“ be he ; and, therefore, it is no wonder, that,
“ the Word being a thing highly spiritual, and
“ abiding for ever, a perfect man should be en-
“ abled to confer with it, as he would with one
“ of the angels of the Most High : although the
“ form of the Word transcends them all, in an
“ infinite degree, according to the assertion of
“ our Fathers of blessed memory in *Ain doreshin*:
“ From every word, which proceedeth from the
“ mouth of Jehovah, there was an angel created;
“ as it is said in scripture, And all the host of them

“ by the breath of his mouth. From this saying
“ of theirs it is wholly manifest, not only that an
“ angel was created from it, but that its quality
“ transcends that of an angel ; because from it,
“ by virtue of its extension, was the angel created.
“ Now the assertion, that from it was the angel
“ created, is precisely what we have written on
“ the text, And all the host of them by the breath
“ of his mouth ; that by the exhalation of his
“ mouth, he gave them existence. But the host
“ of heaven are the angels ; as the quality of the
“ Word rises infinitely above them.” The as-
sertion, then, that the Word of Jehovah is a
real subsistency, of the same quality and substance
with Jehovah himself, has the sanction and au-
thority of R. Moses Alschech. For, if, as the
learned expositor is seen to inculcate, the pro-
lative form of the Word be a literal and substantial
emanation from the interior of the Supreme Being,
by the efficacy and power of which the whole
angelic host was brought into existence, its
divinity is confessed ; and, as to its individual
subsistency, that is equally apparent, whether we
regard its prolative, or its intrinsic, form ; for,
though the prolations of it may be many in
number, and in that sense there may be as many
subsistences of the Word as there are individual
prolations ; yet, can there be but one primary

archetypal, and first-begotten prolativ Word, to which all others in point of time, as well as in point of order, are to be deemed posterior; so that its individual excellence, in whatever light we consider it, shall always be superior to theirs; but, if we regard its intrinsic form only, which the learned Rabbi himself appears to do, when, speaking of it in general terms, he emphatically denominates it, the Word; we make it a subsistency inseparable from the godhead, I say, a subsistency, and not an accident, because nothing essential to the divine nature can be really an accident; and that ideality, which constitutes the intrinsic form of the Word, is necessary to the very being of a God, there can exist but one opinion in the metaphysical world. Neither is it to be ranked, as some may imagine, with what theologists call the essential attributes of the deity; for goodness, mercy, and other affections of that complexion, not being strictly intellectual, but only relative modes of exercising the divine will, and incapable of existence without objects, such as man, on which to be employed; do not necessarily and eternally belong to the divine nature; because those objects, which are required to give them birth, have subsisted neither of necessity, nor from eternity; but ideality, or the intrinsic form of the Word, must always have

subsisted; because, if we remove that, we leave nothing to exist, as God, except matter; whereas if that be retained, we find in it alone whatever may be thought necessary for forming the divine essence. In either of the two cases, therefore, whether we apply the doctrine of the Word, as enforced by R. Moses Alschech, or as it may be collected from Philo Judæus, to the illustration of the targumic interpreters; we shall elicit a sense for the phrase, the Word of Jehovah, very different either from that which confounds the Word with the Jehovah himself, or from that which makes it a mere accident, and places it figuratively, not really, in the same relation to the Supreme Being, in which a word of the mouth or a word of command stands to ourselves; so that, to speak the most favorably of those who have propagated such erroneous opinions, we may well say, that they must have presumed to determine the question, before they had given themselves time to consider the subject.

I next proceed to shew the personal divinity of the Habitation, or, as it is generally called by the Targumists, the Habitation of Jehovah, the holy Habitation of Jehovah, or the Habitation of God. The annexed examples I have selected out of many others, as being amply sufficient to convey to us an adequate notion of the several purposes

to which the expression is applied; as well as to substantiate the truth of its divinity and personality. It will be proper to premise, however, that in all the passages in which the Targumists have, the Habitation of Jehovah; the inspired penmen have either, Jehovah, or God; and, that, like the Word of Jehovah, it is never once employed as the translation of, angel. Thus then Onkelos:

*וַיַּפְתַּח יְיָ לִיפָּת וַיְשַׁרְיוּ שְׁכָנָתוֹתָה בְּמִשְׁכְּנָה דָשָׁם:

“ Jehovah will widen Japheth; and will fix his Habitation in the tents of Shem.”

†הָאֵת שְׁכָנָתָא דָיִ בִּינָנָא אָם לָאָן:

“ Is the Habitation of Jehovah amongst us, or not?”

‡תַּעֲלִנוּ בְּטוֹרָא דְאַחֲנָתָךְ אַתָּר מַתְקָן לְבִתְהָ:

שְׁכָנָתָךְ אַתָּקָנָתָא יְיָ מִקְדָּשָׁא יְיָ אַתָּקָנָה יְדָךְ:

“ Thou shalt make them ascend, and shalt plant them on the mountain of thy inheritance, the place destined for the temple of thy Habitation, the place which thou hast prepared, O Lord; the sanctuary which thy hand, O Lord, hath got prepared.”

§וְאַעֲבָר יְיָ שְׁכָנָתוֹתָה עַל אַפּוֹהִי וּקְרָא יְהוָה אֱלֹהִי רְחִמָּנָא וְחִנָּנָא מְרַחִיק:

רְגֹן וּמְסִנִּי לְמַעַבְדָּת בְּפָנָיו וּקְשׁוֹתָה:

“ And Jehovah caused his Habitation to pass before his face; and he exclaimed; Jehovah, Jehovah; a God merciful, and gracious, of great forbearance;

* Gen. c. ix. v. 27. + Ex. c. xvii. v. 7.

† Ex. c. xv. v. 17. § Ex. c. xxxiv. v. 6.

“and, that abounds in acts of goodness and truth.”

***חָלָפֶת דְּקַצְתּוֹן יְתִ מִימְרָא דִי** **שְׁכַנְתִּיהָ שְׁרִיאָ**
בִּינִיכּוֹן וּבְכִוּתוֹן קְדָמוּהוּ לְמִימְרָלְמָא דָנָן נְפָקְנָא
מִמְצָרִים: “ Because ye have despised the Word
 “ of the Lord, whose Habitation dwelleth amongst
 “ you ; and have lamented before him, saying ;
 “ Why did we come out of Egypt ? ” So
 Jonathan :
 †**אַלَا אָעַבֶּר תְּקוּפָּתְּנוּי וְלֹא יְתּוּבָּ**
מִימְרָי לְחַבְלָא בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲרֵי אֱלֹהָא אָנָא מִימְרָי
לְעַלְמָא קִים וְלִיתָּשְׁבַּדְיָי כְּשַׁבְּדָי בְּסָרָא דְּדִירָן עַל
אַרְעָא כָּן גְּזִירָתְּמִימְרָי דְּבִינִיכּוֹן שְׁכַנְתִּי קְדִישָׁא
וְלֹא אַחֲלָפֶת בְּקָרוֹא אָוחָרִי שָׁעַד יְרוֹשָׁלָם : I “ I
 “ not execute my high indignation, neither shall
 “ my Word again devastate the house of Israel ;
 “ for I am God, my Word subsisteth for ever ;
 “ neither are my servants like the servants of
 “ mankind, that dwell upon the earth. Thus do
 “ I decree by my Word, whose holy Habitation
 “ is amongst you, that I will not exchange Jeru-
 “ salem yet for another city.” So Jose, or
 whoever was the Targumist of the hundred
 and tenth psalm.
 ‡**שְׁכַנְתָּא דִי עַל יְמִינָךְ מַהְא בְּיּוֹם** “ The Habitation of Jehovah,
 “ at thy right hand, shall crush kings in the day
 “ of his wrath.” So again :
 §**טָוָר סִינִי דְּמַכְזָע** “ It
 “ רָנָג מִימְרָא דִי לְאַשְׁרָאָה עַל שְׁכַנְתִּיהָ

* Num. c. xi. v. 20.

† Hos. c. xi. v. 9.

‡ Ps. cx. v. 5.

§ Ps. lxviii. v. 16.

“ is low mount Sinai, on which the word of “ Jehovah desires to fix his Habitation.” These testimonies, which might easily have been increased in number, will satisfy the reader, that the Habitation of Jehovah is a divine subsistency, distinguished as well from Jehovah himself, as from his Word, by the locality of its condition. The idea of place, however, is not always affixed to it, so as to confine its operations to a particular spot; for that were inconsistent with what is affirmed of its smiting kings, in the day of its wrath; and of its passing, in a visible manner, before the face of Moses. There is, also, in several of the instances quoted, a manifest distinction to be observed between it and the Word; a certain demonstration, that the Habitation of Jehovah is not to be confounded, in the Targumim, with the word of Jehovah; but that, whilst they evidently assert a divinity common to both, they are careful to represent them as being different in personality.

But the Talmudists, as well as the Targumists, make frequent mention of this Habitation; ascribing to it omnipresence, and speaking of it, in every respect, as they would of the deity. Thus we read in the Talmud; * אין השכינה שורה אלא על חכם גבור ועשיר ועניו: “ The Habitation

* Massechet Nedarim, Perek 4.

“ doth not rest but upon a man of wisdom, of
 “ might, of riches, or of humility.” So R. Chasda:
 *וְאָמַר ר֔ב חַסְדָּא בְּתִחְלָה קָדָם שְׁחַטָּא וּשְׁרָאֵל הִיְתָה
 שכינ' שרויה עם כל אחד ואחד שני כי ה' אלהיך
 מתחלך בקרב מחניך וכיוון שחתאו היהת שכינה
 מסתלקת מהם שני ולא יראה בך ערות דבר ושב
 “ R. Chasda said : At the first, before :
 “ Israel sinned, the Habitation abode with every
 “ individual ; according to that which is said in
 “ the scripture : For Jehovah, thy God, walketh
 “ in the midst of thy camp : but, after they
 “ sinned, the Habitation departed from them,
 “ agreeably to what is written : And he will not
 “ view in thee any nakedness ; but will return
 “ from thee.” So R. Eliezer:
 †וְאָמַר אֵלָעֶזֶר כָּל
 אדם שיש בו נסות הרוח שכינה מיללת עלייו
 שני כי רם ה' ושפָל יראה ונבואה מרחק יידע :
 “ R. Eliezer said : Of every man, in whom there is
 “ the spirit of pride, the Habitation thus speaks,
 “ in the scripture : For Jehovah is high, and the
 “ humble he seeth ; but the lofty he regardeth at
 “ a distance.” So also R. Hoshaya, R. Ishmael,
 R. Sheshet, and R. Abhu :
 ‡רְבִי הַשְׁעָא סִבְר
 שכינה בכל מקום דאמר ר' הושעיא מנין שהשכינה
 בכל מקום שני אתה הוא ה' לבדך שלוחיך לא כשלוחיך
 בשך ודם שלוחיך בשך ודם מקום שמשתלחין לשם

* Talmud, Masseceth Sota, Perek 1.

† Ibid.

‡ Talmud, Bava Batra, Perek 2.

הוויזין שליחותן אבל שלוחיך למקומות שם שתלחין שם
 מהזירין שליחותן שנ' התשלח ברקים וילכו ויאמרו
 לך הננו יבואו ויאמרו לא נאמר אלא ילכו ויאמרו
 מלמד שהשכינה בכל מקום . ואף רבי ישמעאל
 סבר שהשכינה בכל מקום דתנא דברי רבי ישמעאל
 מנין שהשכינה בכל מקום שנ' הנה המלאך הדובר
 ביוצא ומלאך אחר יוזא לקראותו אחורי לא נאמר
 אלא לקראותו מלמד שהשכינה בכל מקום . ואף רב
 ששת סבר שכינה בכל מקום דאמר ליה رب ששת
 לשמעיה לכל רוחתא אוקמן בלבד מזורה ולאו
 משום דלית ביה שכינה אלא משום דמורו ביה
 מינאי ורבי אבהו סבר שכינה במערב דאמר רבי
 אבהו מי אורייה אור יה : - R. Hoshaya sup-
 " posed the Habitation to be in every place.
 " For R. Hoshaya said : Whence can it be proved,
 " that the Habitation is in every place ? From
 " the words, Thou art Jehovah alone ; thy mes-
 " sengers are not like the messengers of flesh
 " and blood ; for the messengers of flesh and
 " blood return from the place, whither they are
 " sent with their messages ; but thy messengers,
 " to whatever place they are sent, there they
 " return their answers, according to what is
 " said : Canst thou send the lightnings, so that
 " they shall go, and say to thee, Lo ! here we
 " are ? That they shall come and say, is not
 " written ; but, go and say ; which fairly in-
 " culcates, that the Habitation is in every place.

“ R. Ishmael also was of opinion, that the Habitation is in every place. For it is the tradition of the school of R. Ishmael; Whence is it demonstrated, that the Habitation is in every place? From the text; Behold the angel, who spake with me, went forth; and another angel went forth to meet him. It is not said, went forth, after him, but, to meet him; which teaches, that the Habitation is in every place. R. Shesheth, too, believed, that the Habitation was in every place. For R. Shesheth said to his servant; I may be faced to pray towards any quarter, except the East; not that the Habitation is not there, but, because the infidels inculcate, that it is there only. But R. Abhu thought, that the Habitation was in the West. For what, said R. Abhu, is Ouriah, the West? It is, Our-jah, the air of Jah.” Thus from the manner, in which they contend for its ubiquity, they evidently regard it as a subsistency of the godhead; miraculously present in particular places only, but essentially present in all parts of the world.

Besides the Talmudists, however, we can allege in support of our position the most illustrious of modern authorities; where the essence of this Habitation, together with its attributes or properties, is more fully declared. Great things are

predicated of it by R. Judah Levita;* who ascribes to its efficacy the various mutations both of body and mind, that had happened to his countrymen. כבר אמרתי לך כי זה מריוחך כחות
 השכינה כי הייתה בישראל כמעלת הרוח בגוף האדם
 מועילה אותן החיות האלקית ונונתת להם זו והדר
 בגופותם ובתבונתם ובmeshchenim ובעת שמתרך
 מהם משלכת עצם ויתבערו גופיהם ווישתנה יופיהם
 וכשהיא מתרחק מיחידים נראה על אדם האיש
 ההוא סימן התרכז אור השכינה ממנו כאשר נראה
 התרכז הרוח פתאום בעבר פחד או דאגה משנה
הגוף : I have already told you, that this hap-
 “ pened to them on account of the recession
 “ of the virtues of the Habitation. For it acted
 “ the same part in Israel, that the spirit does in
 “ the body of man; conferring on them divine
 “ life, and giving them splendour and glory in
 “ their persons, in their vestments, and ha-
 “ bitations; but, when it withdrew itself from
 “ them, their counsel became infatuate, their
 “ persons degenerated into a brutal form, and
 “ their external beauty was completely changed.
 “ And when it departed from individuals only,
 “ there might be perceived in the ground of such
 “ individuals some certain mark of the departure
 “ of the light of the Habitation from them; just
 “ as we perceive sometimes on a sudden the

* Sepher Cosri, Part ii. p. 126.

“ departure of the vital spirit, through terror
“ or grief, which quite changes the body.”

The opinion of R. Moses ben Maimon, that it is a created light or glory, has already been noticed; the very contrary to which, it equally appears, was the belief of R. Moses Gerundensis. Thus in applauding the targum of Onkelos, the former observes:—* **וַיַּכְסֵס הַכְסָא לִקְרֵיה בְּלֹמֶר**— “ **לְשִׁכְנָה אֲשֶׁר הוּא אֹור נְבָרָא**” “ But he makes “ the Throne relate to his Glory, that is, to the “ Habitation; which is a created light.” And, as to the latter, he expressly declares in the passage cited from him in a preceding part of this chapter, that the Habitation is no other than Jehovah himself; and that this, too, was the opinion of the ancient Jewish Fathers. It does not appear to me, however, that R. Moses Gerundensis confounded the Habitation with the personal subsistency of Jehovah; on the contrary, he seems to have thought with the Talmudists, that it is something derived from the godhead, not the godhead itself personally considered. Thus on a certain text he is found to comment:—† **וְעַל דָּרֶךְ**— “ **הָאָמֵן לְשִׁכְנָנוּ תְּדַרְשׁוּ לְכַבּוֹדְוּ תְּדַרְשׁוּ וּבְאַת שְׁמָה לְרָאֹת אֶת פָּנֵי הָאָדוֹן הִי אֱלֹהִי יִשְׂרָאֵל וּמְמַנוּ אָמְרוּ חַכְמִים שִׁכְנָה :** “ But in truth the sense of the “ words, To his dwelling shall ye seek, is, To

* More Nevochim, part i. c. 28.

† Com. Deut. xii. 5.

“ his glory shall ye seek ; and thither shalt thou “ come to behold the face of the Lord Jehovah, “ the God of Israel.” From it, too, say the sages, is derived the Habitation. Neither can I be persuaded, that Maimonides, in giving his definition of it, had any other thing in view than the manifestation or splendour of the Habitation ; which, as will be hereafter demonstrated, is something wholly distinct from the Habitation itself.

R. Lipman,* in alleging the reason, why the Jews pray with their faces towards Jerusalem, or the East ; has given a testimony of the Habitation being every where present, only he claims for the sanctuary at Jerusalem a more special manifestation of its presence. מה שאנו מתפללים לモורה לפי שאנו יושבים במערכו של ירושלים אענ דשכינה בכל מקום מ"מ גלו שכינה כנגד בית שבירושלים המקדש : “ But with respect to our “ praying towards the East ; that is because we “ dwell to the West of Jerusalem. For, although “ the Habitation is in every place ; yet the mani- “ festation of the Habitation is over against the “ sanctuary at Jerusalem.” But the author, who of all others has written the most plainly and sensibly on this subject, is R. Isaac Abarbinel. He deems the Habitation the same with the כבוד יהוה, the Glory of Jehovah, of the in-

* Nitsachon, c. cxxxiii. p. 38.

spired penmen, in the highest acceptation of that phrase; and defines it a spiritual subsistency, emanating immediately from the godhead, and superior to all other spirits. These are his words: *

ולכן יותר נכון לומר שכבוד יי' הרוחני העליון נאמר על העולול הראשון ממנו יתברך כי הוא תחלת דרכיו וראשית ברייתו והוא הנקרא בלשון חז"ל שכינה כי אין ראוי שנחשוב שקראו הקדושים הهم חז"ל שכינה לאור הנברא המוחש בדבריו הרבה המורה ולא גם כן שקראו שכינה עצמותו ומהותו בדבריו הרמן אבל קראו שכינה אותו העולול הנ אצל ממנו יתברך ראשונה ולהוותו מכל הנמצאים וראשית לכלם בקש משה השנתו ונמנעה ממנו בעור בחיים הייתה כמו שאמר כי לא יראה האדם וחי כי להיוות העולול ההוא הראשון שמו כשם רבו והוא חותמו של הקדוש ברוך הוא מכונה בכינוי אמר עלייו ופני לא יראו וזה הוא דעת אנקלוס שתרגם ופני לא יראו ודקמי לא יתחzon : It is, therefore, much more reasonable to assert, that the Glory of Jehovah, the spiritual most high, is meant of that which primarily proceeded, as an effect, from the deity; for it is characterized as the beginning of his ways, as well as the first of his creatures; and is the same with what is called, in the language of our church, the Habitation. For we are not to suppose with

* Com. on Ex. c. xl. v. 34.

“ R. Moses ben Maimon, that the holy Fathers,
“ of blessed memory, called that light which was
“ created, and which falls under the senses, the
“ Habitation; nor yet with R. Moses ben Nach-
“ man, that they meant by the Habitation the
“ very substance and quiddity of the Supreme
“ Being: on the contrary, they denominated
“ Habitation that very being, which, by way of
“ effect, emanated from the deity the first; and
“ seeing that he comprehends within himself all
“ other existences, and is the origin of them all,
“ Moses was desirous of apprehending him, but
“ was debarred during this life, according to
“ what is said: Because no man shall see me,
“ and live; for he being the primary effect, his
“ name is the same with that of his author,
“ and, as he is the very image of the Holy One,
“ with his suffix annexed to him, Jehovah says of
“ him: But my face shall not be seen. Such, no
“ doubt, was the opinion of Onkelos; who has
“ paraphrased the words, But my face shall not
“ be seen, But the beginning of me shall not be
“ seen.” It were easy to produce many more pas-
sages, in which the author has expressed himself to
the same effect; but as the foregoing is sufficient
to convey to us an adequate conception of what
we ought to understand by, the Habitation of
Jehovah, I shall refrain from quoting them.

There is, however, in R. Bechai a passage, which relates so nearly to this part of our argument; that I cannot but give it in his own words, without any abridgment.

* השיב לו הש"י פני ילכו הוא השליח מטטרון שבו אני נדע בעולם על המעשימים הנוראים והנפלאות הנפלאות באותות ומופתיו שיעשו על ידו שמתוכם ידעו אוטי הבריות ויראוני כענין שכותב וירא ישראל את היד הנפלאה אשר עשה יי' במצרים ויראו העם את יי' ויאמינו بي' . והנהותי לך מלשון נחת רוח כלומר אניתו לך שלא יתנהג עמק במדת הדין קשה אלא במדת הדין רפה כלולה מן הרחמי והשליח הזה הוא הכבוד הנקרא שכינה ולכך תרגם אונקלוס שכינתי תהך . ומשה לא נתרצה בו מפני שהוא מדת הדין ולכך השיב אם אין פניך הולכים אל תעלנו מזה אם אין פניך בעצמך ובכבודך זהו מדת התפארת והכבוד . אל תעלנו מזה כי בשתי מדות האלה הוצאה אותו ממצרים שני' בכח נדול וביד חזקה לא ביד חזקה בלבד . וכן דרשו רזיל בוגאלת מצרים לא על ידי מלאך ולא על ידי שרפ' ולא על ידי שליח שהוא מטטרון אלא הק"ב בעצמו ובכבודו כלומי' התפארת והכבוד והק"ב הודה לו בכח נס תורה שהוא כאלו אמר את הדבר אשר דברת לך פני ילכו נס את הדבר אשר דברת אותה אעשה כיוון שהודה לו בזה ומצא עת רצון בקש למעלה מזה ואמר

הראנו נא את כבודך והוא חכתר ולא נעה
 בזה וධשיב לו לא תוכל לראות את פני ותרנס
 אונקלוס אפי שכינתי כי מפני שהשכינה ברושי
 ביתה בסוף האצילותות לכך קרא תחלת האצילותות
 פנים כי תחלת כל דבר ועליונו יקרא פניו ועל
 כן השיב לו לא תוכל לראוי את פני כלוי הפנים
 העליונים פני האצילותות אבל הנה מקום אני
 וראית את אחורי הוא אחריות האצילותות והוא מה
 שהורה לו כבר אני עבוי כל טוביו ולשון אחורי
 מלשון אחר שהוא מער' כלשון אחריך וקדם צרתי ני
 וידוע כי השכינה במערב ופני לא יראו ראשית
 האצילותות : The Lord answered him : My face :
 shall go ; the legate, Metatron, whereby I am
 known in the world for the stupendous, mar-
 vellous, and grand exploits, with signs and
 wonders, which were achieved, by his hand ;
 on account of which the creatures both know
 and fear me, according to the declaration of
 scripture : And Israel feared the mighty hand,
 which the Lord wrought in Egypt ; and the
 people feared the Lord, and they believed in
 the Lord. And I will cause rest for thee ; in
 the sense of, a spirit resting, that is to say, I
 will make him rest with thee ; so that thy
 people shall not be ruled by the property of
 stern judgment, but by the property of mild
 judgment, made up of mercy. Now, this
 legate is the glory, called the Habitation ; and

“ therefore, Onkelos has paraphrased the words
“ —My Habitation shall go. Moses, however,
“ did not acquiesce in him, because he was the
“ property of judgment; and, therefore, he made
“ answer: If thy face do not go, permit us not
“ to ascend hence; if thy face do not go with
“ thy substance and thy glory, that is, the pro-
“ perty of beauty and glory, allow us not to
“ ascend from this place; for by these two pro-
“ perties hast thou brought them forth out of
“ Egypt, as it is said: By a great power, and a
“ strong hand; not, by a strong hand only. So
“ our Rabbies of blessed memory speak of the
“ deliverance from Egypt as having been effected
“ neither by an angel, nor by a seraph, nor by
“ the legate, called the Metatron; but by God
“ himself, in his own person and glory, that is
“ to say, beauty and glory. The Lord, then,
“ replied to him: The thing which thou hast
“ mentioned, I will also do; the particle, also,
“ fully manifesting the sense to be, as though he
“ had said; The thing which I myself mentioned
“ to thee, My face shall go; as well as the thing,
“ which thou hast mentioned, that will I do. No
“ sooner did he gratify him in this request, and
“ he found the opportunity favorable, than he
“ made a still higher request than this, and said;
“ Let me, I pray, see thy Glory, that is, the

“Crown: In this he was not complied with ;
“but received for answer, Thou canst not see
“my face. The targum of Onkelos is, The face
“of my Habitation ; for since the Habitation is,
“amongst the heirs of its family, at the end of
“the emanations, he therefore terms the begin-
“ning of the emanations, the face ; because the
“first and supreme part of every thing is termed
“its face. He answered him, therefore ; Thou
“canst not see my face, that is to say, the
“highest front, the face of the emanations ; but,
“behold, there is a place with me, and thou shalt
“behold my hinder parts, that is, the latter end
“of the emanations ; it being what he had al-
“ready promised him, in saying, I will cause to
“pass all my goodness. The signification of,
“my hinder parts, is to be deduced from, behind,
“that is, West ; as it occurs in the scripture :
“Behind and before hast thou formed me ; and
“we know, that the Habitation is in the West.
“But my face shall not be seen ; namely, the
“beginning of the emanations.” It is a difficult
matter, either from this or any other testimony
of R. Bechai, to ascertain precisely what he un-
derstood by, the Habitation ; but, that he deemed
it a spiritual emanation inferior to the Crown or
the Face of Jehovah, and so nearly allied to the
Metatron as, in some measure, to be inseparable

from it, is apparent from the above as well as from many other passages in his commentary on the Pentateuch.

From an impartial estimation, then, of all the preceding evidences, varying, as they certainly do, in circumstances not hard to be reconciled ; we may lawfully infer the divinity, as well as the personality of the Habitation. The discrepancy to be perceived in the statements alleged, is rather apparent than real ; and has originated in a high degree from the different sides, on which the subject has been contemplated. Such of the Targumists or Talmudists as speak of its residing in heaven, or in the sanctuary at Jerusalem ; do not thereby intend to deny, that it is also in other places. Maimonides, in asserting it to be a created light, has committed no error ; for such was the form, in which it used often to manifest itself : nor yet Nachmanides, in affirming it to be actually Jehovah ; for such, no doubt, it is as to its substance or essence : still less has Abarbinel erred, in maintaining a definition somewhat different from both ; as the resplendent splendor with which it was accompanied, when visible, was only accidental not essential ; and the sameness which is conceded to obtain between it and Jehovah, personally considered, is not in respect of individuality or subsistency, but of the divine nature

or substance. That it should be occasionally denominated a legate, is not to be wondered at ; if we call in mind only the general acceptation of that term, which is used for any instrument whatever, and consequently might be easily accommodated to the agent in question, especially if made to appear in a visible shape. These observations being duly attended to, we shall find no difficulty in reconciling with the more correct opinion of Abarbinel, whatever may seem to disagree with it, either in this or in any other work.

Such are the nature and force of the present argument, the constituent parts of which I have been the more anxious to fix and establish ; because from the uncertain and imperfect manner, in which it had been always brought forward by our ablest divines, it could not obtain that credit to which it is entitled.

CHAPTER XII.

THUS having from the Targumists, as well as from the Cabbalists and the Daruschists, duly established a trinity of persons subsisting in the godhead, distinguished from each other by their proper designations ; I advance to the confir-

mation of the only remaining argument, which is, that these respective distinctions of the Cabbalists, Daruschists, and Targumists, are applied to the same three persons; and in point of order, correspond with each other. This is, truly, an argument of great weight and importance; for if the coincidence, now to be pointed out, cannot with any colour of reason be regarded as the effect of chance; it must be attributed to that necessity which the nature of the subject imposed on them, when they made those distinctions.

That they do not mean differently with respect to the first personal designation, is in need of no proof; for that were to suppose them at variance in their notions of the first cause. The *Supreme Crown* of the Cabbalists is, doubtless, the same with the *Jehovah*, or *God*, of the Targumists, and the Daruschists; which, like *Adam*, the name of the first man, severally designate the form as well as the individual; and, therefore, whilst they stand as the proper designations of the first person, they are used at the same time as appellatives for the second and the third. This observation being diligently attended to, the confusion, naturally arising from their promiscuous application to all the personalities of the godhead, will easily be prevented. For some of the Cabbalists have distinguished between the *Infinity* and the *Supreme*

Crown; intending, by the former, the godhead taken in the abstract; but, by the latter, the first Numeration individually, to which the designation, *Supreme Crown*, is not unfrequently restricted. But others, on the contrary, as cannot fail to be observed from the various extracts contained in this work; speak of the *Supreme Crown*, as diffusing itself through all the other Numerations; and oblige us to understand it of the divinity in its abstract form, just as the humanity of Adam may be supposed to have diffused itself through the whole of his posterity. The equivocal signification, therefore, of the term, *Supreme Crown*, is a circumstance to which the highest regard ought to be paid, in weighing what the Cabbalists have affirmed of the first Numeration.

That the personal designations, the Word, the Wisdom, and the Law, of Jehovah, together with the Metatron, are appropriated to the same individual subsistency, and in all respects correspond with each other, will, by a mutual comparison of whatever has been separately delivered of them, be fully established. In the citations from Onkelos and the Jerusalem Targumist, it is repeatedly asserted; that the world was created by the Word of Jehovah. Now this is an act of power, which is expressly affirmed by the Cabbalists of the second Numeration, the Wisdom of Jehovah.

Thus R. Abraham ben Ezra, in opening his commentary on the Proverbs of Solomon, asserts; that by the Wisdom of which the inspired penman has given so grand and noble a personification, was created every thing out of nothing, as the scriptures declare. זה חלק האזהרה הודיע בו מעלה החכמה הקדומה כי בה נברא יש מבלי מה: " In this part of the admonition, the author demonstrates the excellency of the primordial Wisdom ; as by it was created something out of nothing." R. Abraham ben David,* also attributes to its agency the creation of all things ; and corroborates the position from scriptural authority. אמן היותו השם ית' ראשית וסבה לכל הנמצאים כן החכמה ראשית לכל הנמצאים שני מה רבו מעשיך " But whilst Jehovah is truly the beginning and the cause of all existences, in the manner that form is the cause of all those things which are in actual being ; so is Wisdom the beginning of all existences, according to the scripture: How manifold are thy works, O Lord; by Wisdom hast thou made them all : the earth is full of thy possession!" R. Menasseh ben Israel† inculcates the same doctrine. Cum vero certum sit, nihil

* Com. on Sepher Jetsira, Perek i. Mishna 5; as cited by Rittangel.

† Conciliator, Quæs. 1. p. 170.

in S. Scriptura perperam aut frustra scriptum esse, dicunt theologi, multa hanc vocem mysteria continere; quia בראשית, Beresit, significet חכמה, Hochma, scientiam, unam ex decem illustrissimis lucibus. Unde colligunt, innui hic, per summam sapientiam mundum a Deo creatum, juxta verba sapientis, Dominus cum scientia fundavit mundum: i. e. scientia fuit causa instrumentalis in creatione mundi. “ But since it is “ certain, that nothing in the scripture is written “ without design; the Divines assert, that this “ term contains many mysteries: for Beresit, In “ the beginning, signifies, Wisdom, one of the “ ten most illustrious lights or numerations. “ Hence they argue, it is here insinuated, that “ God created the world by the highest Wisdom; “ agreeably to the words of the wise author: “ The Lord hath laid the foundation of the earth “ by Wisdom, that is, Wisdom was the instru-“ mental cause in the creation of the world.” To the preceding authorities I might add that of the Jerusalem Targumist; who, in rendering the first words of Moses, has given, instead of, In the beginning, By wisdom, God created the heavens and the earth; that is, says R. Chajim Videl—* “ באמצתה חכמה עלונה— “ By the me-“ dium of the celestial Wisdom.” But besides, that

* Annot. on the Targumin, printed at Amst. 1682.

they manifestly identify themselves by their creative character; there is another mode of proving them to be one and the same from the consideration, that they both are called man after the image of God. In a quotation already made from Philo Judæus, as well as in many other passages of his works, the divine Word is styled the image man, or the man after the image of the Supreme Being. Now, this has its origin from the doctrine of the Cabbalists; who often employ the term, man, to denote the divine nature in the abstract, in the same manner that it is used to express humanity in the abstract by other theologists. Hence the text, Let us make man in our own image, they expound of a conference among the numerations of the godhead; the second of which, having emanated from the first numeration, the Supreme Crown, is called the man in the image of the Crown; and is made the author of the speech, Let us make man in our own image. Thus we read in *Tykune Sohar*:* וְמַהְיָה נָהָר אָדָם דָּמָר נָעָשָׂה אָדָם דָּא חַכְמָה עַלְאָה דָּאִידָּה בְּרוּקָנָא דְּכָתָר: “ But what man is that who says, Let us make “ man? This is celestial Wisdom, who is in the “ image of the Crown.” The Word, therefore, denominated by Philo the man after the image of God; and the celestial Wisdom, denominated by

* *Tyk.* 70. fol. 119.

the Cabbalists the man in the image of the Crown, must needs be one and the very same subsistency.

But the Law, in like manner, is asserted by the Daruschists to have been the instrumental cause of the creation; and for which nearly the same passages of scripture are adduced, as for the second Numeration. Thus whatever Solomon, in the book of Proverbs, has predicated of Wisdom; R. Moses Alschech and R. Moses Ilpeles* have applied to the Law; not to mention the many other testimonies, which those learned Daruschists supply of a similar tendency. The position is briefly maintained by R. Menasseh ben Israel.† Exemplum hujus regulæ habemus in **בראשית**, Beresit, cuius literæ eundem efficiunt numerum quem verba, **בתורה יצר**, Lege formavit. Hinc colligunt Legem fuisse causam instrumentalem mundi. “Of this rule we have an “example in the expression, Beresit, *In the be-“ginning*, the letters of which make up the same “number with, Battorah yatsar, *By the Law he“formed*. Hence they infer, that the Law was “the instrumental cause of the world.”

That the Word is the same with the Law, may be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the reader in a variety of ways. The passages already alleged from the Targumin of the Pentateuch on

* Hoil Mose, Perek iv. p. 20. † Concil. Quæs. I. p. 171.

the one hand, and from R. Moses Ilpeles on the other; clearly demonstrate their individual sameness, by making them one and the same instrument in the fabrication of the universe. Moreover, the former is constantly used by the Targumists for the, אמרת יהוה, of the inspired penmen; and that in this situation it can scarcely signify any thing besides the Law, the subsequent extracts will render apparent. Thus Onkelos:*

אריו נטרו מטרת מירך וקימך לא אשנו: “ For they have “ observed the keeping of thy Word; and thy “ covenant have they not changed.” Here it can have no other meaning than the Law of Jehovah; which was promulgated by the hand of Moses, and enjoined on the Israelites to be strictly observed. So the Targumist on the hundred and nineteenth psalm: “ וְכַדּוּ מִירֵךְ נְטָרִית ” And “ now I have observed thy word.” That is, according to R. Solomon:† תורתך שמרתיך: “ And now, since I have been “ occupied in the schools of divinity, I have kept “ thy Law.” So also in another pasuk: עיני מטרתא דצפר ורמש למלא במירך: “ Mine eyes are ready, before either the morn- “ ing or the evening watch, to rehearse in thy “ Word.” That is, according to R. Abraham:‡ קודם לכל אשמורא שאשיה אני באמרתך הכתובה

* Deut. c. xxxiii. v. 9.

† Com. in loc.

‡ Ibid.

ב תורה שנמלת הרשעים כרשותם והצלת הצדיקים :
 “ Before any watch, do I meditate in thy word,
 “ which is written in the Law ; that thou re-
 “ compensest the wicked according to their
 “ wickedness, but deliverest the righteous.”

The most direct, however, and unequivocal evidence is that of R. Moses Alshech. In one place he maintains, as a position universally admitted, that the articulating voice of Jehovah is the same with the Law, which created the world.*
 כי קול ה' הדוב' הוא ה תורה שבה ברא את העולם :
 “ For, as is well known, the voice of
 “ Jehovah, that speaketh, is the Law by which
 “ he created the world.” In another place, having started the objection, how both assertions could be true, that the heavens were made by the Word, as well as by the Law of Jehovah ; and, that, if, as the scripture declares, the heavens were made by the Word, then there could have been no necessity for the pre-existence of the Law, replies by observing, that the Law is actually denominated the Word of Jehovah :†
 ולא יננד זה אל מאמ' הכתוב בדבר ה' שמים נעשו כי
 ה תורה דבר ה' תקרא כמאמ' הכתוב כי דבר ה'
 “ But this is not repugnant to the de-
 “ claration of scripture, That by the Word

* Shusanath Haamakim, fol 10, col. 4.

† Com. Prov. viii. 22.

“ of Jehovah were the heavens created ; because
“ the Law, according to the same declaration
“ of scripture, is called the Word of Jehovah ;
“ for the Word of Jehovah is in it.” There is,
therefore, the most ample ground for concluding,
that the Word and the Law are individually the
same thing.

That the Metatron is not a different sub-sistency from either the Law, or the Word, or the Wisdom, of Jehovah, may be collected from the several testimonies already alleged in their respective places. It is, unquestionably, the same with the Word. For as the Word is designated by Philo Judæus the eldest and the chief angel, the Name of God, and, the man after the image ; so is the Metatron designated by the Jewish expositors in general the chief of the angels, the Almighty, the Jehovah ; and by R. Simeon ben Jochai, man the less, who was made in the image from above. It must needs, also, be the same with the Law and the Wisdom of Jehovah ; for the Beginning, whereby the Elohim created the heavens and the earth, is expounded by the author of *Tykune Sohar* of the Metatron, no otherwise than we see it expounded by theologists, in general, of the Wisdom and the Law of Jehovah. For the confirmation of these positions, it is merely necessary to recur to the numerous au-

thorities respectively advanced in the course of this work.

Let the foregoing evidences, then, be deemed sufficient proof of our argument; that the Word, the Wisdom, and the Law, of Jehovah, together with the Metatron, as defined respectively by the Targumists, Cabballists, and Daruschists, agree with each other in import and signification, and exclusively refer to the second personality of the godhead.

That the Habitation, the Understanding, and the Throne of Glory, are severally meant of the third divine subsistency, admits of being proved in the most unequivocal manner. From the testimony of R. Moses Ilpeles and others, it is apparent, that the term, Elohim, as often as it occurs in the Mosaic account of the creation, is interpreted by the Cabballists of the numeration, Understanding. So, indeed, affirms R. Bechai:*

והבואר הכתוי יופח באפוי נשמה שהוא אצולה מחי המלך שהן עקרו של מלך ולמעלה מן המלך אם כן עקר נשמת האדם מיסוד הבינה שהוא התשובה שם עקרה ושם תשובה וזהו שכחוב והרוח תשובה אל האלhim אשר נתנה הזכיר האלhim והוא כמו בראשית ברא אלhim שהוא התשובה : The import of the passage is; And he breathed into his nostrils an afflatus, which was emanated

* Par. Vajesma Jethro, fol. 104, col. 4, Amst. ed.

“from the life of the king; which life is the
 “original principle of the king, and higher than
 “the king; therefore, the original principle of
 “the soul of man is from the foundation of Un-
 “derstanding, which is the same with Returning.
 “There is its root, and thither shall it return;
 “and this is the sense of the text, But spirit
 “shall return to the Elohim, who gave it: the
 “scripture says, Elohim; which has the same
 “signification here, that it has in the text, In
 “the beginning created Elohim, that is to say,
 “Returning or Understanding.” To this may
 be added the words of R. Abraham ben David:*

זה הנטיב נקרא אומן כי הוא כל אמונהו של
 הקב"ה ר"ל בינה שני יהוה בחכמה יסד ארץ (ע"ט)
 כונן שמים (הה) בתבונה (בינה) ואומר בראשית
 (הכמה) ברא אלהי (בינה) :
 “This way is de- :
 “nominated the artificer; for it is the instrument
 “of the workmanship of God, that is, Under-
 “standing, as it is said: Jehovah by Wisdom
 “hath founded the earth, that is, diadem; es-
 “tablishing the heavens, that is, beauty; with
 “consideration, that is, with Understanding. It
 “is also said: In the beginning, that is, By
 “Wisdom; created God, that is, Understanding.”
 Now this very agent in the creation, which the

* Com. on the third of the thirty-two ways of Wisdom: pre-
 fixed to Sepher Jetsira.

inspired penman simply terms, God; but the Cabbalists, Understanding; is by R. Solomon Jarchi* expounded of the Throne of Glory. וּרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים מִרְחָפֶת' כִּסֵּא כְּבוֹד שָׁוֵם בָּאוּרָה וּמִרְחָפֶת עַל פְּנֵי הַמִּים בְּרוֹתָה פִּוְּשָׁל הַקְּבָ"ה וּבְמַאֲמָרוֹ בְּיוֹנָה הַמִּרְחָפֶת עַל הַקְּנָן : " And the Spirit of God brooded, that is, the Throne of Glory stood in the air, and brooded on the surface of the waters, with the spirit of the mouth of God, and with his Word; like as a dove broodeth over her nest." The same Elohim is likewise interpreted of the Throne of Glory by the author of *Tykune Sohar*, as cited in a former chapter.

But with respect to the Throne of Glory and the Habitation, R. Solomon has certainly placed them in apposition, and, therefore, identified them; in his commentary on the vision of Ezekiel וּרְנָה רֹוח סֻרָה בָּאָה מִן הַצְפּוֹן הִיא מִרְכַּבָּת † : " behold a whirlwind came from the north, that is, the chariot of the Throne of Glory, the Habitation; as is asserted in the story." R. Lipman‡ seems to have explained the one by the other, and to have regarded them as terms wholly equivalent. וְהִיא דְמַצִּינוּ שְׁרָתָה הַשְׁבִּינָה בְּמִצְרָיִם וְעַל יְהוּקָאֵל בָּאָרֶץ כְּשָׂדִים זֶה מִשּׁוּם דְשְׁבִּינָה עַמָּהֶם

* Com. on Gen. c. i. v. 2.

† C. i. v. 4.

‡ Nitsachon, ch. ccli, p. 138; Com. on Jonah.

בגולותם שני ושמי כסאי בעילם : That we find
 it asserted, that the Habitation dwelt in Egypt,
 and with Ezekiel in the land of the Chal-
 dees ; is because the Habitation was with them
 in their exile, as the scripture saith : And I
 will place my Throne in Elam." R. Isaac
 Abarbinel* expressly maintains, that they are one
 and the same divine subsistency. כי הנה עם
 היהות שנקרא בכתובים השמים בשם כסא לא חמא
 בשום מקום לא בכתב ולא בדברי חכמיינו זכרונם
 לברכה שנקראו השמים כסא הכבוד. כי הוא שם
 נאמר בלבד וביחוד על מעלה הסבה הראשונה ועל
 השכינה העלונה הרוחנית : For certainly
 though the heavens be called in scripture by
 the term, throne ; you can nowhere find, neither
 in the scripture, nor in the writings of our
 learned divines, of blessed memory, that the
 heavens are called the Throne of Glory ; as this
 is a term applied peculiarly and exclusively to
 the excellency of the first cause, and to the most
 high spiritual Habitation." This too agrees
 with the doctrine of the Cabbalists, as set forth
 by the author of *Tykune Sohar*.†
 דאיןון שש מעלה לכסא דמתמן כל נשמתין באלה אצלות
 דשכינה עלה איהי כסא כבוד : Which are
 the six steps to the Throne ; whence are all

* Com. on Exodus, c. xxiv. v. 1.

† Tyk. 69. fol. 116.

“ the souls by way of emanation from the upper “ Habitation, which is the same with the Throne “ of Glory.” There can be no doubt, therefore, that the Throne of Glory and the Habitation are one and the same thing.

Finally, that the Habitation and Understanding are designations of the very same subsistency, is demonstrable from the circumstance, that the Elohim, which occurs in the first section of Genesis, and which is expounded by the Cabbalists of the numeration, Understanding, is in like manner by R. Eliezer expounded of the Habitation.

אמר רבי:^{*} ואלעזר והא שכינה לא כתיב בה בראיה אלא אצילות והוה ליה למיר ויברא אד' את האדם מאי אלקים אלא שכינה אתקרי אלקים ועל ההיא נשמטה דאתייהית בבר נש אהמר ויברא אלקים את האדם בצלמו בדיקנא דשכינה : “ R. Eliezer said : But, behold, of the Habitation “ it is not written, that it was created, but that “ it emanated. He should have said, And Elo- “ him created the man : Who is Elohim ? Doubt- “ less, the Habitation is called Elohim ; and of “ the soul, which was inspired into man, is it said, “ And Elohim created the man in his own image, “ in the image of the Habitation.” In another part of the same work, the one is put in appo-

* Tyk. lxii. fol. 97. col. 2.

* וְאֵינוֹ תְּלִיתָה וְדָא—שְׁבִינוֹתָא סְפִירָה תְּלִיתָה— It is the third; and “this is the Habitation, the third numeration,” which establishes their identity in the most unequivocal terms.

Such are the proofs afforded by the present opportunity, that these several designations of the Targumists, Cabbalists, and Daruschists, are spoken of the same three personalities of the godhead; and coincide, as to the order and degree in which they rank with each other. The reader, however, is always to bear in mind, that, as the knowledge of the Cabbala is widely different both from that of the Targumin and that of the Darushoth; and, as scarcely any author can be mentioned, who was equally conversant in each of them; it ought not to be a matter of wonder, if in some instances we find contradictory accounts, and these passages of holy writ applied to the one subsistency, which ought with strictness of propriety to have been applied to the other. Something of this complexion may be detected in a quotation from Abarbinel; who has accommodated those texts of Solomon to the Habitation, or Throne of Glory, which are invariably applied by other divines to the Wisdom or the Law of Jehovah. It is not, however, a mistake of any

* Tyk. lxx, fol. 119, col. 2.

great magnitude; and may find its equal, even in a pillar of our own church. The great Irenæus,* of whose orthodoxy it would be criminal to doubt, has actually dilapsed into the same error with Abarbinel; having expounded of the Holy Spirit those very words of Solomon, which are exclusively applied to the Word by the rest of the Fathers.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE various arguments, from which the second general Proposition was offered to be proved, being now concluded; it remains, that we take a retrospective view of what has been advanced, and recapitulate the evidence on which the decision is founded. The Proposition, as will easily be recollected, was, for the sake of method and perspicuity, divided into two parts; in the former of which was to be demonstrated, that the deity exists in a plurality of persons; and in the latter, that this plurality is a trinity. Such a division of the argument may by some, perhaps, be thought to have been dictated without any regard to the utility of the subject; the former position being evidently contained in the latter,

* *Adversus Hæreses*, lib. iv. c. 37.

in that the trinity is itself a plurality, and the only plurality which requires to be demonstrated. But the case is far otherwise. The chief difficulty, in attempting to recommend to the consideration of the Jew the trinitarian hypothesis, is to bring him to yield, that God exists in a plurality of persons at all ; for that being once duly acknowledged, the preference of the trinity to any other number would readily obtain the sanction of the most scrupulous objector. I have, therefore, in treating this part of the Proposition, omitted no argument whatever, which appeared to me to be defensible at all points ; some of which, indeed, have been urged by others before me, in the learned languages ; but by none with that deference to the authorities of the Jewish church, and that anticipation of doubts and objections, which are the characteristics of this work.

By evincing, that the highest spiritual natures with which we are acquainted, next to the deity, have a sameness of essence existing in a diversity of subsistences ; we derive from analogy a presumptive argument, that the godhead, which is also a spiritual substance, must, to be consonant to reason, equally exist in a plurality of persons. This is followed by an argument of no less weight and consideration, that, as all spiritual substances were not, like bodily forms, created at the first

out of nothing, but were actual emanations from the divine being; we are compelled to infer the fructifying power of the first cause, and that the individual natures of man and angel were so many personalities of the godhead, substantially partaking of its essence; though not from eternity, nor in any way necessary to the support of its existence. To these proofs of a plurality are added, that in the sacred writings all the appellations of the deity have the construction of common names, serving to many individuals; and that God is often found speaking of himself in the first person plural. These two positions appeared to the infidel, Volney, in so clear and certain a light; that he has not hesitated to charge the Jews with having wilfully corrupted the scriptures, by converting all those verbs, which are now associated in the singular with the term, Elohim, from the plural to the singular form; in order that they might the better, and more easily maintain their notion of the unity. But though I am far, yea very far, from suspecting the Jews of any such practices; I cannot but think, that, when supported by the opinion of a writer of so much religious neutrality, the positions, as handled in this work, will appear to the more sceptical part of my readers to claim their regard.

These arguments, as I have already observed,

being severally adduced to shew, that the deity exists in a plurality of persons ; do not absolutely evince the truth of the Proposition ; but they have a manifest tendency to corroborate it in degree, and may be received either as positive confirmations of the pluripersonality of the godhead, or, if the reader would rather, as negative testimonies, that it does not exist in one person only. The immediate proof of its truth is, doubtless, from the latter division of the arguments ; in which the necessity of a trinity is demonstrated on metaphysical principles, and in which the numerical unity, so vigorously opposed to it both by infidels and heretics, is justly exploded. By this mode of arguing the point, the trinitarian hypothesis is recommended to the acceptance of mankind on rational grounds ; and is rendered somewhat independent of the testimonies both of Judaism and Christianity. Thus bottomed in metaphysics, the doctrine naturally acquires that accession of evidence, which arises from the many symbolical actions and expressions of the inspired penmen ; from the Numerations of the Cabbalists ; from the actual Pre-existences of the Daruschists ; and from the personal designations of the deity with the Targumists ; not to mention the harmony and concordance of those several distinctions from a mutual comparison

with each other ; all which arguments conspire to fix it on an immovable basis, and to render the truth of the Proposition as impregnable as it is important. To me, indeed, it seems wholly impossible, that a doctrine, so completely fortified by argument and testimony, should be convicted of error, or overturned by the assaults of malignant opposition. Reclining, then, on the merits and strength of my evidence, I decide on the principles of logical deduction ; *That in the sameness of the godhead subsists a trinity of persons.*

CHAPTER XIV.

THAT this is the very form and substance of the trinitarian hypothesis, as embraced by the whole Christian church, is too plain and evident to need confirmation. The very names, God, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, with which we designate the three subsistences of the godhead ; sufficiently manifest from whom we have derived the doctrine, and naturally instruct us to place this fundamental truth of Christianity on the basis of Judaism. It will not be deemed any disparagement to the Christian Religion to say, that all we know, either of the being, or of the attributes of God, the Father, is borrowed from the Jewish

church ; and, whatever does not accord with the attestations of the inspired penmen concerning him, is no part of our creed. In styling the second subsistency the Word, we copy the Targumists, from whom St. John, the prince of the evangelists, immediately took it, and we from him, as will be readily acknowledged. The third subsistency we call the Holy Spirit, in imitation of the most ancient Fathers of the Jewish church ; with whom the Holy Spirit was regarded as synonymous with the Habitation. This last, however, being a point on which considerable difficulty seems to have arisen in the minds of the most learned Hebraists, I shall lay down such grounds of evidence as may be necessary for the support of the position, and then remove the objections with which it is encumbered.

It has been already established on the authority of Abarbanel, that the Habitation is the same subsistency with the Glory of Jehovah ; which is justly represented as a spiritual effect ; emanating or proceeding immediately from the godhead, and co-existing along with it before the creation of the world. Now the manner, in which R. Judah Levita * has identified the Glory of Jehovah with the Holy Spirit, induces the belief, that, by Holy Spirit, he meant the very substance of the

* Sepher Cosri, Part ii. p. 80.

Habitation; and, that with him these were but two appellations for one and the same thing. **וכן מצטייר מן הנשס הדק הרוחני הנקרא אצלם רוח הקדש הזרות הרוחניות הנקר' כבוד ה' ונקרא על דרך העברה ה' בלבד כמו וירד ה' על הר סיני :** “ So is there formed from a subtle, “ spiritual, substance, called among the Jews, “ the Holy Spirit; a number of spiritual forms “ in one, denominated the Glory of Jehovah, “ and, by way of metaphor or translation, Je- “ hovah only; as: And Jehovah descended upon “ mount Sinai.” Here we have the express declaration of the author, that the Glory of Jehovah, which is universally granted to be the same with the Habitation, is formed of the Holy Spirit; nor are we permitted to draw any distinction between them, except that the Holy Spirit is the form or essence, abstractedly considered; and the Glory of Jehovah the individual appearance, which that Spirit assumes. But there are more coincidences of this complexion. In the Mishna* we read, that the Holy Spirit cohabits with the Saints; and renders them meet for the resurrection of the body. **ויראת חטא מביאת לידי חסידות וחסידות מביא' לידי רוח הקודש ורוח הקודש מביאת לידי תחיית המתים :** “ The fear of sinning leads to the possession of

* Massechet Sota, Perek ix.

“ piety ; and piety leads to the possession of the “ Holy Spirit ; and the Holy Spirit leads to the “ possession of the resurrection from the dead.” This agrees with what R. Judah Levita * affirms of the spiritual Habitation. **אך השכינה הנסתרת** הרוחנית היא עם כל ישראַל אָזְרָחֵי ועם כל בעל דת האמתית זו המעשִׁי טהור הלב נפשו ברה לאלהי יִשְׂרָאֵל : “ But the invisible and spiritual Habi- “ tation is with every indigenous Israelite, and “ with every strict observer of the true Law ; “ who is blameless in his conduct, pure in his “ heart, and clean in his conscience towards the “ God of Israel.” So also in the Talmud † we read, that when the three prophets, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, died ; the Holy Spirit departed from Israel. **תנו רבנן ממשתו נבאים האחרונים חני זכריה מלאכי נסתלקה רוח הקודש מישראל :** “ The doctors have handed down to “ memory, that when the latter prophets, Haggai, “ Zechariah, and Malachi, died ; the Holy Spirit “ departed from Israel.” Now this is precisely what R. Judah Levita ‡ has recorded of the departure of the Habitation. **כى הנבואה התמידה עם אנשי בית שני ארבעים שנה מהוקנים הנעוּרי בכת השכינה שהייתה בבית ראשון שהנבואה הנקנית נסתלקה בהסתלק השכינה :** “ For pro-

* Sepher Cosri, Part v. p. 384.

+ Massechet Sanhedrin,

Perek i. סנהדרין ‡ Sepher Cosri, Part iii. p. 238.

“ phecy continued with the men of the second temple forty years, that is, with such of the elders as had been assisted by the power of the Habitation, which was in the first temple ; the regular art of prophecy having departed on the departure of the Habitation.” Finally, R. Elias Levita * declares, that the Fathers called the Holy Spirit, the Habitation ; and alleges a proof from the commentary of Jarchi. קראו רזיל לרוח הקדש שכינה על שם שהוא שכן על הנביאים וכן רוח יעקב פירש רשי שרתת עליו שכינה : “ The doctors of our church, blessed be their memory, called the Holy Spirit, the Habitation ; because it dwelt with the prophets : and accordingly the words, And the spirit of Jacob revived, are expounded by R. Solomon Jarchi, “ And the Habitation rested upon him.” These evidences, which might easily be increased in number, indubitably prove, that the terms, Holy Spirit, and Habitation of Jehovah, at least when taken in their fullest acceptation ; are meant of one and the same thing.

But it has been urged as an objection, that they sometimes appear to be distinguished ; and especially in a certain place of the Talmud ; † where of the five things, which were wanted in the second temple, two are asserted to have been,

* Tishbi, p. 247.

† Masseceth Joma, Perek i.

the Habitation, and, the Holy Spirit. There is not, however, in this passage of the Talmud, if the matter be but duly considered; any real ground of objection. The glorious being of which we now speak, is defined, by the highest authorities, to be a subtle spirit proceeding immediately from the godhead, and to which all other spiritual natures, whatever, whether celestial or terrestrial, owe their origin and stand subordinate. By this the prophets of Israel were inspired; their champions endowed with supernatural strength; and the more religious part of their community assisted in their sacred meditations and devotional exercises. In short, there was no kind of heavenly communion, or divine intercourse, between the Jew and his God, either before or since the diruption of the Jewish polity; which was not accomplished through the medium of the spiritual Habitation. To the Israelites, when stationed under mount Sinai, it appeared in a luminous and visible shape; and continued to do so for many ages after, as well in the tabernacle which was constructed by Moses, as in the temple of Solomon. This splendor or visible appearance of it, which by the Targumists* is called, יקר שבנהתא, “the glory of the Habitation;” by R. Judah Levita, † **השכינה הנראית עין בעין**

* Jer. Targ. Ex. xiv. 14, &c. † Sepher Cosri, Part v. p. 384.

“ the Habitation ocularly seen ;” by R. Lipman,* גָּלוּי הַשְׁכִינָה, “ the manifestation of the Habitation ;” and by R. Isaac Abarbinel,† דָּגֵל הַשְׁכִינָה “ the insignia of the Habitation ;” is very often styled, simply, the Habitation ; just as the Glory of Jehovah is sometimes, in the scriptures, expressed simply by, Jehovah. To this equivocal use of the term had writers but paid the necessary attention, they would not have hesitated to pronounce, that the Habitation and the Holy Spirit were one and the same thing ; notwithstanding, that they were enumerated distinctly in the words of the Talmud. If we do but reflect, that the splendor which indicates the presence of the Holy Spirit, as well as the Holy Spirit itself, are denominated, the Habitation ; and, that the Holy Spirit, in this place of the Talmud, according to the exposition of Baal Aruch,‡ is used *in specie* for the spirit of prophecy ; we shall feel no surprise at this assertion of the Fathers, nor regard it as repugnant to the truth of the position ; for, certainly, the glorious splendor of the Habitation, and the spirit of prophecy, were two of those things which were wanted in the second temple of Jerusalem. The use, indeed, of the Holy Spirit for, the spirit of prophecy only ; and,

* Nitsachon, c. lxxviii. p. 50.

† Com. 1 Kings, c. viii. v. 66.

‡ Aruch Chabod.

vice versa, the use of the spirit of prophecy for, the Holy Spirit, in its widest acceptation, are causes of much ambiguity in many of the Jewish authors; and we should do well to attend to this observation in reading their works. If in the following sentence of Maimonides* the terms, Habitation, and Holy Spirit, be not perfectly synonymous; they are to be distinguished only according to the rule which has been now laid down.

עשו בבביה שני אורים ותוממים כדי להשלים
שמנה בגדים ואף על פי שלא היו נשאלין בהן ומפני
מה לא היו שואליין בהן מפני שלא היה שורה שם
רוח הקודש וכל כהן שאינו מדבר ברוח הקודש ואין
שכינה עליו אין נשאלין בו :

" They made in the
" second temple, the Urim and Thummim, so as
" to perfect the eight vestments; although they
" did not inquire with them. But why did they
" not inquire with them? Because the Holy
" Spirit did not rest there; nor did they ever
" inquire by any priest, who did not speak by
" the Holy Spirit, and upon whom the Habitation
" did not rest." Let it not, however, be supposed, that, because the prophetic Spirit is here, and in other places denoted simply by, the Holy Spirit; it may not be equally expressed by the term, Habitation. R. Judah Levita, as must have been already observed, makes the art of

* Hilch. Kele Hammik. c. x. sect. 10; as cited by Wagenseil.

prophecy depend entirely on the faculty of the Habitation; and in the subsequent testimony of R. Moses Ilpeles,* they are plainly synonymous.

תשובה דיה שבך ישראי שאינו מהול אינו יכול
לראות פנוי שכינה שכן היה אומ' איוב להבריריו נס
לו לבב כמוכם ולא אמר ככם להודיע שרוה הנבואה
שהיה בו היה ביתר את והראיה שאני נולדתי מהול
כמו שאמר חז"ל שבכל מקום שאומר תם או תמים
הוא שנולד מהול וזאת הוא הסיבה שלא נופל אני כמו
מכם ר"ל כשהבא לי רוח הנבואה אני נופל אני כמו
אי מכם לפי שהיו ערלים ואין להם כח לקבל פנוי
שכינה בקומה זקופה : In answer to this it is
"to be observed, on the authority of the Da-
"ruschists, that no Israelite, who has not been
"circumcised, is able to behold the face of the
"Habitation. For this reason, Job said to his
"friends: I too have a heart as well as you;
"he did not say, like you; insinuating, that the
"spirit of prophecy, which was in himself, was
"of a superior character; and as a proof of
"it, he says, I was born circumcised; (agreeably
"to what our divines of blessed memory assert,
"that, wherever it is said in scripture, he was a
"perfect or upright man; it means, that he was
"born circumcised) and this, says he, is the
"reason why I do not fall amongst you, that is,
"when the spirit of prophecy comes upon me, I

* Hoil Mose, Perek iii. p. 108.

“ do not fall down like one of you ; for they were “ uncircumcised ; and had no power in themselves “ to meet the face of the Habitation with an “ upright countenance.” Let the foregoing evi-
dences, then, be deemed a sufficient proof, that, with the most celebrated authorities of the Jewish church, the Holy Spirit is synonymous with the Habitation ; and, that, as such, it has been received into the Christian church for the third personality of the godhead.

But the agreement of the names is not the only way, in which the consent of Judaism with Christianity, in this important doctrine ; admits of being proved. To each of the persons singly, the same attributes and perfections, the same operations and services, are ascribed by the Christian, as by the Jewish divine ; not to mention the order which is usually observed in naming them jointly ; for in this respect, too, the Christian coincides with the Cabbalist and the Daruschist. To God, individually and properly so called, we assign that homage and adoration, which are due from creatures to their creator ; that excellency and perfection, which must of necessity belong to so glorious a being ; together with all those attributes and properties, which have ever been declared by the advocates of reason, as well as of revelation, to be worthy of the divine nature. He

is styled by the Greek and Latin fathers in particular, The Father, and the Lord of the universe ; titles on no occasion given either to the Word or to the Holy Spirit, but appropriated exclusively to God, the Father. In the History of Christ, who was certainly a most zealous cultivator, as well as a most eminent pattern of piety ; he is held up to the world, as the parent of mercy and goodness ; as the author of our redemption and salvation from sin and death ; as the rewarder of the just, and the avenger of the wicked. The very thoughts and actions of mankind are said to be open to his inspection ; and to be vile or acceptable in his eyes, in proportion as they assume the complexion of virtue. The incomparable majesty, and intrinsic excellency, of his divine nature, are no less the theme of our admiration and praise, than his bounty and goodness. "Thou greatest and highest origin of the " invisible world," says the learned Arnobius,* in a pious address to the Supreme Being ; " thou, who art invisible and comprehensible by " no natures at any time ; thou art worthy, truly " worthy, if so be only we may be permitted " with mortal eloquence to say, that thou art " worthy ; to whom every living and rational " being should never desist from confessing his

* *Adversus Gentes*, Lib. i. p. 22.

“ obligations, and returning his thanks; to whom
“ the whole animal creation in concert ought
“ to kneel in adoration, and to supplicate with
“ never ceasing prayer. Thou art the first cause,
“ the place and the space of the material world,
“ the foundation of all things whatsoever, infinite,
“ unbegotten, immortal, perpetual, alone; whom
“ no bodily figure can describe, no boundary in-
“ clude; void of quality and of quantity, without
“ situation, without motion, and without figure;
“ of whom nothing is to be affirmed or expressed
“ in terms of mortal speech; of whom that we
“ may form any conception, we must muse in
“ silence; and that busy thought, wandering
“ through the gloom of night, may gain any
“ traces of thee, we must be hush and contem-
“ plative.” “ There is no necessity,” says the
eloquent Cyprian,* “ why you should inquire
“ into the name of God. God is his name. It
“ is only when a number of individuals require to
“ be distinguished by their own proper terms,
“ that names are necessary. But God, who
“ exists by himself, has God only for his name
“ or appellation. He is, therefore, one, and
“ every where wholly diffused.” Here we find
the Father maintaining, what in the course of
this work has been frequently inculcated, that

* *De Idol. Vanitate*, p. 15.

God is a proper as well as a common appellation; proper to the first subsistency of the godhead, the Father of all things; but common to the second and the third, which, though equally God with the first, do yet stand in need of being distinguished from it by the personal designations of the Word and the Spirit.

But with respect to the second subsistency, the Word, ST. JOHN* expressly declares; that it is God, and the instrumental causation of every thing, that was created at the first, or which at present exists in the world. ST. PAUL;† that it is God, and of an equality with the first person of the Godhead. BARNABAS;‡ that it is a subsistency anterior to the creation, and a brightness of splendor incalculably greater than that of the sun. CLEMENS ROMANUS;§ that it is God, and Spirit. IGNATIUS;|| that it is God, eternal, invisible, impalpable, impassible, and spiritual and co-existent with the Father of the universe, before the creation of the world. JUSTIN MARTYR;¶ that it is a subsistency different from the first personality of the godhead in number, but

* Gospel, c. i. v. 1. &c. † Ep. to the Philippians, c. ii. v. 6.

‡ Ep. Vos. ed. p. 218, &c. § 2 Ep. ad Corinth. p. 141, et 159.

|| Ep. ad Polycarp. p. 12; et Ep. ad Ephes. p. 17; Vos. ed.

¶ 1 Apol. p. 44; et 2 Apol. p. 95, &c.; item, Dial. cum Tryph. p. 284, 287, &c. Colon. ed.

not in mind; having existed with him anterior to the works of the creation; that it is God, and eternal; the primordial Wisdom, the angel or legate of Jehovah. **TATIAN** ;* that it is God, and a spiritual subsistency, emanating from the Father of the universe. **ATHENAGORAS** ;† that it is God, of the same substance with the first cause, the energy of the godhead, and the framer of the universe. **IRENAEUS** ;‡ that it is God, the maker of the world, and is glorified by the Father of all things; that it revealed the deity to mankind, and discoursed with the patriarchs of old. **THEOPHILUS ANTIOCHENUS** ;§ that it is God, the Wisdom of God, the Beginning of the creation, and the promulgator of the will of God. **CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS** ;|| that it is the most manifest deity, the Wisdom, evident goodness, almighty, and truly divine power of God; the creator of the world, the genuine son of the divine mind, the original light of light, and equal with the Lord of the universe. **ORIGEN** ;¶ that it is God, the power, and the Wisdom of God.

* *Orat. con. Græcos.* p. 145, et 146; *Colon. ed.*

† *Leg. pro Christ.* p. 10, 27, &c.

‡ *Adversus Hær. Lib. iv. c. 14, 37, &c.*

§ *Ad Autolycum, Lib. ii. p. 100;* *Colon. ed.*

|| *Strom. Lib. v. p. 547.* *Admon. ad Gentes, p. 62, 68, &c.*

¶ *Contra Cels. Lib. i. p. 52;* *et Lib. iii. p. 135.*

CYPRIAN;* that it is God, the power, the Wisdom, and the reason of God. ARNOBIUS;† that it is God, in the highest acceptation of the term; and that from eternity. LACTANTIUS;‡ that it is God, the voice, and Wisdom of God; of the same mind, spirit, and substance, with the Father of all things; and stands in the same relation to him, as the stream does to the fountain from which it flows, or as a beam of light does to the sun from which it emanates; that it is a spirit, which was caused to subsist prior to the formation of the world; and to which the appellation of deity is due on account of its paternal power and majesty, having been the instrumental causation of the angelic as well as of the sublunary world. I need not say, that in all situations, in which it is named in concert with the other personalities of the godhead; it ranks second in order.

But the Holy Spirit has equal testimony given of it, as being both God and a person. ST. PETER§ inculcates; that it is God, and the author of all prophecy. ST. PAUL;|| that it abides with every true worshiper of God, confers on the saints all spiritual power and wisdom, and distributes them to every man, severally as it pleases.

* De Idol. Vanitate, p. 15. + Adversus Gentes, Lib. i. p. 40.

‡ De Vera Sap. Lib. iv. p. 403, &c. § Acts, c. v. 3, 4.—
1 Ep. c. iv. v. 14. 2 Ep. c. i. v. 21. || 1 Cor. c. xii. v. 4—11.

IGNATIUS;* that it operated by Moses and the prophets, and is of equal honor with God and his Word. JUSTIN MARTYR;† that it speaks by the psalmist either in its own person or in that of the Father. ATHENAGORAS;‡ that it operated by the prophets, is an emanation from God, streaming from him and returning to him again, like a beam of the sun; that it emanates from God as light does from combustion, and is united in respect of power with the Father and the Word. IRENÆUS;§ that it proclaimed the covenants of God by the prophets, as well as jointly co-operated with the Word in the formation of the worlds, whereby the ministration of angels to the deity was rendered unnecessary; for the Word and the Spirit, being his own form and offspring, ministered unto him in all things that he wanted. CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS;|| that it is one in number, and in every place. CYPRIAN;¶ that it is one in number, as well as one in mind with the Father and the Word; and cannot be reconciled to the man who is at variance with either of the other two persons of the godhead. To this I may add, that in all cases in which the

* Ep. ad Magnes. p. 33, 37. Ep. ad Philip. p. 99, 100.

† Dial. cum Tryph. p. 255: item, 2 Apol. p. 56.

‡ Leg. pro Chris. p. 10, 11, &c. § Adversus Hær. Lib. iv. c. 37.

|| Pæd. Lib. i. p. 102. ¶ Ep. ad Jub. p. 203. Oxon. ed.

mention of the three persons is made conjointly, or when it is necessary to determine the order in which they are to stand with each other ; the Holy Spirit is placed last, being postponed to the Word.

Such are the testimonies on which I have chosen to manifest the agreement of the Christian with the Jewish professor, relative to the order, attributes, and perfections which they respectively assign to the personalities of the godhead. In making a selection from the Greek and Latin Fathers, I have been careful to adhere to such of them only, as lived in the first three centuries of the christian church. These, indeed, were the oracles of the times in which they flourished ; who, by their extraordinary learning and piety, conciliated throughout the whole of christendom such a degree of authority in matters of faith, that they are now regarded as subordinate only to the evangelists and apostles. To have descended to the single testimonies of the Fathers, lower than the end of the third century, would have been vain and nugatory ; as the beginning of the fourth gave rise to the admirable and divine Athanasius, who maintained the trinitarian hypothesis with such astonishing acuteness and success, that it was soon after formed into a creed or symbol, and has been received ever since, with

the exception of a very few schismatics, by the whole body of Christians as the standard of orthodoxy. There remains, therefore, no doubt, that the trinity, as here enforced, is the legitimate doctrine of Christ, and forms an essential part of that faith which every true member of his church is bound to profess.

CHAPTER XV.

BUT if there be so remarkable and striking an agreement between the Jew and the Christian, in their metaphysical disquisitions of the divine nature; a question naturally arises, why, to this day, the professors of Judaism should be so avowedly hostile to the doctrine of the trinity, and should have been led to consider it, all along, as the most objectionable and blasphemous article of the Christian faith? To this I reply, that their hostility is founded in ignorance and mistake; originating, in part, from the incompetent manner in which too many of our divines have handled the subject; partly, from the misapprehensions of their own writers, who, being ill informed of the principles of our religion, are apt to charge us with the consequence of positions which we do not maintain; but most of all, perhaps, from the

circumstance, that, in two or three texts of scripture, the vulgar sense has taken place of the true one with respect to the divine unity.

It is not to be dissembled, that a number of our writers have rushed to the defence and discussion of this tenet, without being in the least acquainted with the previous explanations of it by the Greek and Latin Fathers; as well as without an adequate knowledge of the science of metaphysics; so that many of their statements not only disagree with those of the ancient Fathers, but are repugnant to right reason, and even inconsistent with each other. Some, on the contrary, there are; who, from a spirit of indolence, or something worse, dissuade us from meddling with the subject in any fashion; and propose, that the doctrine should be received, implicitly, without any investigation of its truth, or illustration of its meaning. Into such defenders of our creed, therefore, should the Jewish inquirer unfortunately cast his eye; it ought not to be a matter of wonder, if, instead of being constrained to acknowledge its credibility, he should be more strongly confirmed than ever in his prejudices against it; and should be finally led to contemn a religion, the rationality of which the very advocates themselves despair of demonstrating.

But though the incompetency of a few polemics

to furnish a proper and consistent account of it may be one impediment to its favorable reception ; the shameful ignorance and injustice, with which the generality of Jewish writers arraign and condemn the doctrine, are still stronger impediments ; and are the more to be regretted, as they proceed entirely from a reluctant disposition, and highly culpable neglect, on their own parts, to become acquainted with the merits of the tenet, as unfolded by those who were masters of the subject. They erroneously conclude, that, because we make God have a son, and speak of that son, as of a person of equal divinity with God the Father ; we destroy the divine unity, and induce a number of Gods. This, however, is an error, in which they ought to be undeceived. That we affirm the second subsistency of the godhead to be the son of God, and God, personally so called, to be the father of that son ; is not to be denied : but, in this affirmation, we assert nothing which is not equally implied in the appellations, Jehovah, and, his Word ; as adopted into our church, and employed by themselves. To the Jew it cannot be unknown, that in the sacred dialect, any product or effect whatever may be termed a son ; so that, with Moses,* the growth of a year is called the son of a year ; and, with

* Num. vii. 17.

R. Moses Kimchi,* a word, consisting of four letters, is called a son of four letters; the parts of speech, also, are denominated the sons of speech. Contemplating, then, the Wisdom or Word of Jehovah, as an effect of the divine mind; and R. Moses Botril† has truly remarked, that, **—וְעַל כָּרְחָנוּ מִן הַמְהַשְּׁבָה תֹּצֵא הַחֲכָמָה**— “whether we will or not, Wisdom must proceed from mind;” the christian is justified in naming that effect the son, the only begotten son, or, as Clemens Alexandrinus has aptly expressed it, the genuine son of the divine mind; and the divine mind itself, or, if the reader should prefer it, then Jehovah himself, the father of that son; as these, like mind and wisdom, are correlative terms, the consideration of the one necessarily exciting always the consideration of the other. That this is the light, in which the Fathers of our church regarded the subsistency of the son; is apparent from Origen.‡ “Nor can Celsus,” says he, “demonstrate, that, because we acknowledge “the son of God; we deny allegiance to the “Supreme Being, and undermine his authority. “Surely, in admiring the son, who is reason, “wisdom, truth, and righteousness, and whatever

* Mahalach Shevili Haddaath. Lib. ii. c. 8. Lib. i. c. 5.

† Com. on Sepher Jetsira, Perek i. Mishna 4; as cited by Rit.

‡ Contra Cels. Lib. viii. p. 386, 387.

“ else we may have been taught to consider so
“ divine an offspring; we are honoring the
“ Father.” To this he soon after subjoins:
“ But we, who have been taught to understand
“ what the son of God is; that he is the reful-
“ gency of his glory, the character of his sub-
“ stance, the stream of the power of God, the
“ pure promanation of the glory of the Almighty,
“ the resplendency of the eternal light, the un-
“ spotted mirror of the energy of God, and the
“ reflection of his goodness; are sensible, that
“ such a subsistency must be the son of God, and
“ that God must be his father. Neither is there,
“ in this language, any thing unbecoming or
“ unworthy of the deity; when we assert the
“ subsistency of an only begotten son: nor will
“ any one be able to persuade us, that a being,
“ like this; is not actually, and truly the son of
“ the unbegotten God.” This account of the
tenet by a writer, who flourished as early as the
beginning of the third century, ought to satisfy
the unprejudiced reader; that the Christian
church, so far from destroying the unity of the
godhead, by discriminating between the Father
and the Son; maintains nothing, which is not
fully admitted by the Jewish theologists, and
which is not equally conveyed to us by the terms,
Jehovah, and, the Word of Jehovah.

But of all the scruples, which deter the Jew from assenting to the trinitarian hypothesis, the notion, that it plainly contradicts the express declaration of scripture; will be the worst to remove. The words of Moses,* **שמע ישראל יהוה אחד**—**אלהינו יהוה אחד**—“Hear, O Israel! Jehovah, our ‘God, is one Jehovah;” are supposed to be a solemn attestation, that Jehovah, the God of Israel, is numerically one; and, that he exists a solitary person, not in a trinity of persons, as the christians contend. That unity of number is also unity of person, has been strenuously maintained in the course of this work; and, therefore, if the oneness here attributed to Jehovah, can be proved to be oneness of number, the notion of a trinity of persons subsisting in Jehovah will be completely refuted. But that this is by no means the sense of the text, shall be manifested by arguments and authorities of sufficient weight and number, I hope, to set the question at rest.

First of all, I say, that the duplication of the noun, Jehovah, is of itself an insuperable bar to the meaning, which they would affix to the words; for, if the author had really intended to declare to the Israelites, that Jehovah, their God, was one in number; he would have said, **יהוה אלהינו אחד**—“Jehovah, our God, is one;” but not,

* Deut. vi. 4.

—**יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְהוָה אֶחָד** Jehovah, our God, is “one Jehovah;” which, on the supposition, that the adjunct, one, denoted one in number, would be quite unintelligible. How should we reconcile it with common sense to say: Hear, O Israel! Samuel, our prophet, is one Samuel; or, David, our king, is one David; which, nevertheless, are constructions of the very same complexion with that under discussion? Secondly, admitting, that the words might be so construed as to retain the signification, which they would assign to them; how could they be connected with the pasuk, which follows, in the form of an inference:
וְאָהָבָת אֶת יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיךְ בְּכָל לְבָדָךְ וּבְכָל נֶפֶשְׁךְ
“And thou shalt love Jehovah, thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength?” Is there, I would ask, any propriety or force of reasoning in the language, that, because Jehovah, the God of Israel, is one in number; therefore, they must love him with all their heart, soul, and strength? or rather, to a man of common apprehension, would not the contrary of this appear infinitely more just; that, as Jehovah is but one God in number, and as there either are, or may be others besides himself, therefore they ought not to love him with all their heart, soul, and strength; but to make a distribution of their affections, accord-

ing to the number and quality of the deities to whom adoration may be due? Such, nevertheless, would be the result of the supposition; that the adjunct, one, here predicated of Jehovah, denoted one in number.

The right explication of the two verses is, doubtless, this. Hear, O Israel! Jehovah, our God, is Jehovah alone; that is, our God, who has been pleased to call himself by the name, Jehovah, from the consideration, that he actually exists, is the only God who does exist; and to whom the name, Jehovah, can properly apply; therefore, thou shalt love Jehovah, thy God, with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy strength: where it is worthy of remark, that the second, Jehovah, is a noun common, having the general sense of the verb, **הוּא**, to be, from which it is derived; and, that the adjunct, one, with which it is associated, is intended to express, not the unity of its number, but the solity of its essence. That this is the certain and undoubted signification of the phrase, **יְהוָה אֶחָד**, “one Jehovah;” may be further corroborated from the testimony of the prophet, Zechariah;* who, in speaking of the times of the Messias, thus declares, **בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא יְהוָה יְהוָה אֶחָד וְשַׁם אֶחָד** “In that day, there shall be Jehovah one; and his name

* Chap. xiv. ver. 9.

“ one:” that is, says R. David Kimchi,* the heathen will acknowledge, that Jehovah is alone, that there is no God besides him; consequently there will be his name alone; as they will not make mention, by name, of any other God in the world; but will make mention of his name only. Here we have the same adjunct, one, annexed to Jehovah, as in the text of Deuteronomy; and that accompanied with a circumstance of time, which precludes the possibility of interpreting it in any other manner, than as it denotes the solity of his essence, and the exclusion of other gods. Indeed, so great is the sameness of the two texts, that R. Solomon* has explained the one by the other; and what ought to cause no small degree of shame in those, who would make the declaration of Moses a ground for opposing the doctrine of the trinity, has made the passage, instead of a solemn attestation of the numerical unity of God, a prediction of the universal worship of Jehovah in the reign of the Messias.

שהוא אלהינו עתה
 ולא אלהי האומות הוא עתיד להיות יי' אחד שנ' כי
 אז אהפוך אל עמים שפה ברורה לקרוא כלם בשם
 יי' ונאמר ביום ההוא ייה יי' אחד ושמו אחד

“ He, who is our God now, and not the God of
 “ the gentiles; will, hereafter, be one common
 “ Jehovah; as it is said: For I will then pour

* Com. in loc.

† Ibid.

“ out on the nations a pure lip ; so that all of
 “ them shall call on the name of Jehovah ; and
 “ as it is again said : In that day, there shall be
 “ one Jehovah, and his name one.” That part
 of the exposition of the words by R. Abraham,*
 which bears particularly on the point in question ;
 is as follows : **דע כי זה השם הנכבד והוא שם העצם**
ואם כן מה טעם לאמרו פעמי שניות וההתשובה כי
אדם שם עצם ושם מקר' שאיננו כן ואם הוא נקרא
מעצם האדמה וכן זה וההעד השם שהוא סמוך אל
צבאות או הערך הוא אלהינו ונכפל כמו כן לומר
אחד והטעם לבדו וראיות עד אין חק ריש כי השם
 “ Know, that this glorious name is a proper
 “ name ; and, therefore, it may well be asked,
 “ why it should be here expressed the second
 “ time ? The answer is, that as, Adam, is both
 “ a proper name, and the name of an accident,
 “ which is not proper, but a mere appellation
 “ from the substance of the earth ; so also is the
 “ name Jehovah : a proof of which may be
 “ found, in that it is used in construction with the
 “ term, **צבאות**, hosts. In other words, he, our
 “ God, is the foundation of our faith ; and is
 “ likewise doubled, on being called, one ; mean-
 “ ing, by himself, or alone : for that Jehovah is
 “ in this sense one, there are proofs without end.”
 The subsequent pasuk is justly regarded by him,

* Com. in loc.

as an inference deduced from the doctrine ; that there is no other God than Jehovah. **וְאֶחָד שָׁאֵן** **לֹנוּ אֱלֹהָה אֶחָד רָקּ הָוּא לְבָדוּ חִיבָּתְךָ שְׁתָאֶהָבָנוּ** “ And since we have no other God but him only ; thou art bound to love him : for we have no other God.” Baal Hatturim* has expounded the adjunct, one, as one in essence, not in number : **וַיְשִׁיבָּסְקָ בֵּין יְיָ וְאֱלֹהֵינוּ לִוְמָר אֶפְעַל פִּי שְׁرָאִיתְךָ כִּמָּה דְמִוּנוֹת** **וְאֶפְעַל פִּי שְׁאָנִי בָּא עַם זֶה בָּמִדְתָּה הַדִּין וְעַם זֶה** **בָּמִדְתָּה רְחִמָּה אֶפְעַל פִּי כָּן הַכָּל אֶחָד** “ There is here a distinction between, Jehovah, and, “ our God ; that is to say ; although you may “ have seen ever so many similitudes ; and al- “ though I may come with the one name, when “ I exercise my property of judgment, and with “ the other, when I exercise my property of “ mercy ; though this may be the case, I say ; “ still they are all one.” R. Bechai is too dif- fusive to be cited at full length ; but that he viewed the unity in question as something widely different from that of number, will appear from **וְאַיִן צָרֵיךְ לִוְמָר בְּגַבְרָאִים הַשְּׁפָלִי** † what follows :

שְׁהָם בְּעַלְיָהֶשְׁנָיו וְחַלּוֹק כִּי נִמְלָא בְּעַלְיוֹנִי שְׁאַיִנְמָ **מִקְבָּלִים שְׁנָיו וְחַלּוֹק שְׁהָם עַצְמִים שְׁכָלִים פְּשׁוּטִים** **וְהָם הַנֶּפֶשׁ וְהַמְּלָאכִים אֵי אָפָשׁ לְאֶחָד מֵהֶם לְהַקְרָא** **בְּשָׁם אֶחָד כִּי כָל מְלָאכָה יְשִׁיבָּתְךָ כְּמוֹהוּ אוֹ גָּדוֹל מִמְּנָה**

* Annot. in loc. + Com. in loc. fol. 229, col. 4.

ואם כן אין אחד שהרי יש נמצא דומה לו במעלהו
ובכחו וכן הנפש יש אחרת דוגמתה או למעלה
מןנה במידיע ודקות ההשנה ועל כן אי אפשר
לשום נמצא מהנמצאים כלם شيء ראוי להקרא
בשם אחד ולא אחד בהם שיאות לו וזה השם כלל
אלא אדון הכל יתב' שהמציא אותן אחר העדרם
והוא האחד האמתי הקודם לרביים והוא חלקיהם
בשמים ממעל ועל הארץ מתחת והוא לבדו האחד
הקדוש שאין לו דומה בענין שנאמר ואל מי תדמיוני
ואשוה יאמר קדוש' ועל דרך הקבלה שמע ישראל
כופ אזניך ושם פסוק שמע עניין היחוד האמתי
המקובל ומהוציאנו אצל יודע האמת בסוד ייחוד
עשר ספирו' שנתהייבנו ליחד את כלן ולהבר
הכל כאח' אם ממטה למטה אם מלמטה למטה :

“ But it is unnecessary to dwell on sublunary
“ creatures, which are capable of mutation and
“ division; for even in respect of heavenly
“ beings, which do not admit of change and
“ division, but are simple spiritual substances,
“ that is to say, the souls and the angels, it cannot
“ possibly be competent to any one of them to be
“ designated by the title of one; as every angel
“ has an equal or superior to himself, and there-
“ fore is no such thing as one; for, behold, there
“ exists his like as to his dignity and his power.
“ So also the soul has another of the same form
“ with itself, or else superior to it, in knowledge
“ and apprehension. It is not possible, therefore,

" for any existent being, whatever, to be fitly
 " called by the title of one; nor is there any
 " one amongst them that this appellation will
 " become, save the Lord of the universe, blessed
 " be he; who, after that they had been in a state
 " of privation, caused them actually to subsist.
 " He is the true one, which precedes the many.
 " He is the god in the heavens above; and on
 " the earth beneath. He alone is the holy one,
 " who has none like him; according to the scrip-
 " ture; But to whom will ye assimilate me, that
 " I should have a likeness, saith the **Holy One?**
 " The exposition of, **Hear, O Israel**, according to
 " the Cabbala, is, Incline thine ears, and hear
 " the pasuk, **Shema**, the matter of the unity,
 " received and treasured up by him who knows
 " the truth in the mystery of the unity of the ten
 " numerations; which we are bound to unite
 " altogether, and to conjoin the whole as one,
 " whether in an ascending, or a descending di-
 " rection." R. Lipman* expatiates at great
 length on this text; and takes occasion to ex-
 pond the sense of the adjunct, one, not only as
 it is used here, but as it is affirmed of the divine
 nature at all other times. First he observes:
 וְהִכְתֹּבוּ הוּא לְשׁוֹן הָוִה וְקָרְיאָתָה לְשׁוֹן אֱדֹנָת
 הַיְלָכֵךְ פִּי לְפִי פְּשׁוֹטוֹ שְׁצֹוֹתָה הַתּוֹרָה וְאָמָרָה

* Nitsachon, in loc.

התקבל יישראל ותאמין שאדון כל שהוא ראשון
 ואחרון הוא אלה והואו אלה הוא אחד כלומר
 שהוא לבדו אדון כל נצח ואיןו משתנה כמו
 שאפרש בעז"ה : The term, Jehovah, as it is
 "written, denotes, being; but as it is pronounced,
 "dominion. Therefore, the literal meaning of
 "the text is; that the Law commands, and
 "says: Do thou, O Israel ! hearken, and credit;
 "that the Lord, how little soever the first and
 "the last he may be, is the deity, and that deity
 "is one; meaning, that he alone is Lord for
 "ever, and is subject to no change, as I shall
 "shew by the help of God." Then endeavouring
 to manifest, how widely the unity of the divine
 nature differs from that of any other being
 with which we are acquainted; he presently
 adds: והרי גם החמה ויהדות שאין מושל ביום
 להארך כמוהו אלא הוא יהודי אחד ואין אחדות
 כמוהו על בן אין יהודו כאחד מן הפרטום ולא
 כאחד מן הכללים ולא כאחד המורכב הנחלה
 לאחדי רבים ולא כאחד נוף הפשות המקבל
 חילק עד אין תבלית אלא אחד מכל צד :
 "So even the sun is singular, in that there is no
 "luminary, which rules by day, to give light to
 "the world, like himself. But he, Jehovah, is
 "singularly one; there being no unity such as
 "he is. Hence his singularity is not that of an
 "individual; nor that of a species; nor that of

“ a compound, divisible into many units ; nor that
“ of a material element, which admits of division
“ ad infinitum ; but he is, in every respect, one.”

R. Isaac Abarbinel,* too, like R. Lipman ; has dwelt on these words at considerable length ; but in no place has he so explained them, as to make the unity, here predicated of Jehovah, an unity of number. He justly remarks, that, in affirming God to be one, there are two species of unity, to which we ought particularly to attend, as inseparable from his nature. **הראשון הוא והוא יתברך** אחד בעצמו בתקלית הפשיות נמנע ההרכבת והרבי לא רבוי דברים עצמים ולא רבוי תאים מקרים לא בנפש ולא חוץ לנפש : השני מניעת השניות וזהו כשהונח היהתו אחד פשוט בעצמו עדיין יפול הספק אם יש שם אלוד יותר מא ולכון להסיד כל מיני הספק האיד עניינו באמרו יי' אחד ולרמו על שני מיני האחדו' האלה אמר בזה הפסוק שני פעמים שם ה' צרף השם הראשון יי' אלדינו לרמו אל המין הראשון מהאחדים שי' המנהיג ואותנו הוא אחד בעצמו פשוט בתקלית הפשיות ולרמו על המני השני מהיהודי אמר יי' בלבד שהוא הש"י מפאת אלדותו לא בבחינת הננתנו אותן הוא ג"כ אחד ואני שני כי מלת אחד תחוור אל שני העניין שוכר יחד : “ The first species of unity is ; that God is one in his substance, being by perfection of simplicity void of composition and multitude ; having

* Com. in loc.

“ neither a multiplicity of substances, nor a multiplicity of accidents, whether animate or inanimate. The second is the denegation of duality. For after it had been stated, that he was one simply in his essence; there would still have remained a doubt, whether there were any other God besides that one. To remove, therefore, every sort of doubt; he enlightens our eyes, by saying, one Jehovah. In order to indicate those two species of unity, he twice mentions, in this pasuk, the name of Jehovah. The first, Jehovah, he associates with, our God; to indicate the former species of unity; that the Jehovah, who governs and directs us, is one in his substance; being simple by perfection of simplicity: but to indicate the second species of unity, he says, that Jehovah, besides being Jehovah in respect of his divinity, and not by virtue of the demonstration, that he rules and governs us; is also one, so as to have no second; as the term, one, has reference to both those meanings, which it expresses at once.” To these luminous comments of Jarchi, Aben Ezra, Baal Hatturim, Bechai, Lipman, and Abarbinel, the utmost deference and regard ought certainly to be paid; as they are all of them authorities of the highest celebrity in that church to which they belong.

But if none of these great men have been able to discover, in this text of Moses, a proof of the deity subsisting absolutely in unity of number ; nor have made it, in any respect, an argument for the subversion of the trinitarian hypothesis ; it must be an act of the most unpardonable presumption, not to say ignorance, in any living opponent, to select it as a sacred ground, on which to assail the truest and sublimest doctrine of the christian religion. The remark now made will particularly hold good in regard of R. Lipman ; whose principal design, in composing his commentary on certain parts of the Old Testament, was to corroborate Judaism, and to refute Christianity ; but who so far from taking advantage of any assistance, which this passage of the inspired penman might be supposed to afford his cause ; has contented himself with endeavouring to shew, that the triplication of the name of God cannot, as some over-zealous Christians had fondly maintained, be an intimation of the trinity.

To a mind, not deeply reflecting on the propensity of the vulgar to error and misapprehension, in matters of religion ; the hostility of the Jews in general to this article of our creed, founded as it is, in a great measure, on the false assumption of a solitary text ; must appear somewhat extraordinary. The history of the cause I

believe to be this. In the infancy and puberty of the Mosaic dispensation, when the Jews were surrounded on all sides by polytheists and idolaters ; they were taught to despise the objects of Gentile worship, as being, what indeed they were in fact, either the inventions of mankind, or creatures of the universe to which no worship was due. In their fervency for the adoration of Jehovah, they contended against the advocates for a multitude of gods ; that there was but one Supreme Being, whom they ought to honor as their sovereign creator ; and that was Jehovah, their God ; who is declared by Moses to be one, that is, as they erroneously conceived, numerically one ; this being the only kind of unity with which the vulgar are acquainted : though the notion has been long renounced by their ablest theologists, as false and untenable. The rise of christianity, which was often professed, without being either practised or understood ; gave occasion, as represented by some, to the numerical unity of Jehovah being still insisted on by the adherents to Judaism. The vulgar christians professed to believe in one God, as well as the Jews ; from whom they also retained the erroneous idea of his being numerically one : but to their adversaries, they naturally appeared to involve themselves in contradiction, when they maintained ; that in this

one God subsisted three persons of equal essence and perfection: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. For if the three persons were actually distinct from each other, and yet equally divine; they must, as the Jews conceived, destroy the numerical and personal unity of God, and form three Gods; just as Peter, James, and John, being each of them singly acknowledged to be a man, must altogether form three men, and not one man, according to the christian extraordinary manner of reasoning on the subject. But if both parties had but laid aside their erroneous conception of the deity being one in number, that is, in fact, one person; and had taken the term, God, as the denomination of the divine nature or form, and as equivalent to, deity, which imports the divine essence only; just as the term, man, is used not for this or that individual, but for the human form in its general acceptation, that is, for humanity; they would have experienced no embarrassment in reconciling the unity of Jehovah with a trinity of persons. For neither in this sense of the term, man, can Peter, James, and John, be said properly to form three men, but only three subsistences of man; it being as repugnant to reason to make, man, have a plural number, when standing for, human nature; and to contend, that they form three men; as it

would be to give, humanity, a plural ; and to argue, that they form three humanities. This, however, was not the way, in which the unlettered amongst the Jews and the Christians agreed to consider the unity of Jehovah ; and consequently, their disputes on the subject generally terminated in anger and disappointment.

To the man who is really conversant in the writings of the Targumists, Cabbalists, and Daruschists ; and who permits himself to be guided by their direction and authority, the doctrine of the trinity can offer no scruples. The Targumist, certainly, distinguishes between, Jehovah, the Word of Jehovah, and, the Habitation of Jehovah ; by ascribing to each of them personal actions and properties ; whilst he makes them all equally God, by assigning to them those effects of wisdom and power which are peculiar to the first cause : and yet he is not accused of having established three Gods, nor of having denied the unity. The Cabbalist distinguishes between the higher Numerations, Supreme Crown, Wisdom, and Understanding ; which he asserts to be no properties, as the names might import, but eternal subsistences of the godhead : and yet he is not charged with having violated the unity of Jehovah, nor with having induced three Gods. Finally, the Daruschist vindicates the eternity and

divinity of the Law, and of the Throne of Glory, by demonstrating, that they actually existed with Jehovah prior to the creation ; and that, on the authority of the inspired penmen, they all denote one and the same thing, that is, one and the same God: and yet he is not condemned for having dissolved the unity by the number of his pre-existences. How then can the professors of Judaism with any colour of propriety object to that tenet, which agrees in every essential point with the principles of their own church ? If they should scruple to denominate the second personality the Son of God, as being something new to them ; that might be obviated by using the appellation, Word, instead of it ; the preference of the one to the other being a matter of no moment to believers in Christianity. Thus invited by condescension to their prejudices on the one hand ; and by a host of authorities, which they are bound to revere, on the other ; they must evince obstinacy more than human, if they still persist in refusing their assent to the truth of this doctrine ; the arguments for which, now that I am going to close the Second Proposition, I would most ardently recommend to their serious consideration.

ERRATA.

P. 28, for the reference to R. Moses Alshech, at the foot of the page, give, * *Shushanith Haamakim*, fol. 12, col. 2; and rectify the marks of the other two references. P. 32; for Chapter V. read Chapter I. P. 41, l. 21; for ל" read ל"ג. P. 47, l. 13; for read מלךין. P. 99, l. 14. for shall read should. P. 169, l. 10; for קרבן read קרב. P. 175, l. 8; for שיעור read שיעור. P. 176, in the reference at the foot of the page; for col. 1, 2 read col. 2, and omit the words, as cited by Rit. P. 194, l. 1; for אל read אל. P. 273, bottom line; for מרא read מ"ר. P. 280, l. 3; bring down the mark " to the end of the next period, after the word *Habitation*.

SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES.

The following Names of Subscribers having been forwarded to the Author, before it was determined to abandon the idea of publishing by Subscription; they are here printed, with all due acknowledgments for their promptitude and kindness in encouraging the design.

Allen, Rev. J. F., Shipton
Andrew, Rev. J., Whitby
Archibald, Mr., Tadcaster
Ashton, Mr., Malton
Broom, C. Esq., Malton
Blomberg, Rev. F. W., Chaplain to His Royal Highness the Prince Regent
Blackden, B. Esq., Hitchenden Green
Caley, Dowager Lady, Brompton Green
Cleaver, Rev. Dr., Malton
Cleaver, Rev. J., Holme Pierrepont
Comber, Rev. T., M. A., Oswaldkirk
Copperthwaite, Mr., Malton
Currer, Rev. D. R., Sutton
Currer, Miss, Eshton Hall
Durham, Hon. and Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of
Duncunbe, Charles, Esq., M. P., 2 Copies
Davies, Rev. R., Malton
Dixon, Rev. G., Helmsley
Frere, Rev. R., Ganthorpe
Frey, Rev. J. S. C. F., Minister of the Gospel to the Jews
Friend to the Author, 2 Copies
Fry, Rev. T., A. M.
Graham, Rev. J., York
Gray, Rev. W., West Rounton

SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES.

Greenwood, Rev. Mr., Malton
Hereford, Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of
Harding, Rev. J., Kirby Mispertem
Jesop, Rev. T., York
Jones, J. Esq., Franklin
Kay, Rev. J., Nunnington
Knox, Rev. Dr. V., London
Knox Vicesimus, Esq., London
Knox, Rev. T., Tunbridge
Llandaf, Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of
Legge, Hon. and Rt. Worshipful Augustus, Archdeacon of
Winchester
Legge, Hon. Henry
Lincoln, Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of
Lloy John, M. D., Whitby
Moorsom, Richard, Esq., Whitby
Oxford, Hon. and Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of
Prowde, Rev. R., M. A., Hovingham; *2 Copies*
Rhodes, Rev. W., B. D., Tadcaster
Richardson Christopher, Esq., Whitby; *2 Copies*
Richardson, Rev. J., M. A., York
Richardson, Rev. J., Old Malton
Slater R. B., Esq., High Wycombe
Soulby, Mr. E., Malton
Stevens, Mr. W., 2, Sion College Gardens, Aldermanbury
St. David's, Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of; *5 Copies*
Thompson, Mrs., Skelton Lodge
Walker, Mr. Malton
Wilson, Mr. J., Whitby
Worsley, Mrs., York
Worsley, W., Esq., York
Wrangham, Rev. F., M. A., Chaplain to His Grace the Archbishop
of York
Young, Rev. T., M. A., Gilling East
Yeoman, Mr. J., Hovingham.

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries



1 1012 01198 3436

DATE DUE

JUN 20 2010

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

